



St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly

Published by

the Faculty of St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, a graduate school of Theology for all branches of the Orthodox Church.

REV. ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN, Editor
NICHOLAS ARSENIYEV, REV. JOHN MEYENDORFF,
REV. WILLIAM SCHNEIRLA

VOLUME V. 46

1961-62

NUMBER 1-2

CONTENTS

THE ORTHODOX CHURCH IN AMERICA

Foreword.	
Rev. Alexander Schmemmann	2
Historical Background of Orthodoxy in America	
Dimitry Grigorieff	3
One Bishop in One City	
Rev. John Meyendorff	54
The Orthodox Church in the United States as viewed from the Social Sciences	
Rev. Constantine Volaitis	63
A Case Study	
Alex Simirenko	88
The Unity of the Orthodox Church in America	
Serge Verkhovskoy	101
Some Quotations	114
The Seminary	118
Book Reviews	122

Editorial and Subscription Offices
537 West 121st Street, New York 27, New York
Tel. MOnument 6-0065

Copyright 1961 by St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary

Subscription Rates:

Yearly Subscription: \$ 3.00

Two Years \$5.00

V.5-6
1961-
62

FOREWORD

Alexander Schmemmann

"Test everything, hold fast what is good."

I Thes. 5:21

In this issue of the Quarterly a group of Orthodox theologians, pastors and scholars inaugurate a free discussion of the various problems of Orthodoxy in America. They may differ from one another in their approach to their problems, but they are united by a common conviction that Orthodoxy in America is entering a critical stage of its growth and development and that this crisis cannot be properly met without a deep and constructive rethinking of the whole situation. It is indeed the tragedy of the Orthodox Church here that the very existence of many a serious problem is either simply denied or else admitted in wrong and misleading terms. In spite of conflicts and difficulties afflicting the daily life of the Church, the official attitude remains one of overwhelming optimism. A historian who a hundred years from now might write the history of Orthodoxy in America basing his research exclusively on official statements would be forced to conclude that at no other age did there exist a more flourishing, spiritual and efficient Church — such is the amount of self-congratulation and self-righteousness distilled in these statements. And yet the crisis is here, and the sooner we understand its nature and look for its solution the better. Crisis does not necessarily mean illness or decay. But it can provoke these if it is not discerned in time. Otherwise it can be the source of renewal and regeneration. We are convinced that the growth of Orthodoxy in America is a condition of tremendous significance for the whole of the Orthodox Church. Some of the general problems of Church life may find their solution here, as America is at present a genuine testing ground for Orthodoxy, for its universal scope and meaning, for its catholicity and its spirit of victory. What we shall or shall not accomplish here will be of greatest significance for the entire Church. Contributors to this discussion do not pretend to know and understand everything, to have solutions for all problems. As I said above, their intention is to arouse a discussion and to refer our situation here to the eternal and vital principles of Orthodoxy. We welcome all those who care about the future of our Church in America to join us in this common search.

The Historical Background of Orthodoxy in America

Dimitry Grigorieff

The Eastern Orthodox Church in North America, numbering approximately 2½ million members, is a certain, but not yet widely realized factor of American spiritual culture. It is ceasing to be a religion of immigrants only and is slowly becoming an integral part of American life. In the Armed Forces of the United States, Eastern Orthodoxy has been given a separate place as one of the major religions, on the same ground as Protestantism, Roman Catholicism, and Judaism. Many states recognize Eastern Orthodoxy as a major religion, and the process is moving on to widespread federal recognition.

The Eastern Orthodox Church in North America is composed largely of people whose forefathers, or they themselves, came to this land from ethnical groups of Eastern Europe: Albanian, Bulgarian, Carpatho-Russian, Greek, Rumanian, Russian, Serbian, Syrian, Ukrainian. The majority of people enumerated here represent countries behind the Iron Curtain, and of these the Russians and Carpatho-Russians are the most numerous. This suggests a special political significance of the Eastern Orthodox Church, or rather churches, since each national branch maintains its own independent administration, liturgical language and tradition. English is slowly creeping into the liturgy. At present it is most widely used in the Syrian Church, and least in the Greek. Undoubtedly, in two generations at the most, English will become the common language of one integrated American Orthodox Church.

Originally, all branches of Orthodoxy were united in the Russian missionary Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and North America, which was under direct authority of the highest governing body of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Holy Synod, in St. Petersburg. The Russian Revolution of 1917 dealt a tremendous blow to

the whole structure of the Russian Church. Waves of disaster quickly reached American shores, and the Russian diocese here plunged into years of tension and disorder.

I.

The Aleutian Island and Alaska were discovered by the captains of the Russian Imperial Navy, Behring and Chirikov, in 1741. They were followed by Russian merchants interested in the skins of the young ursine seals. In 1784 Gregory Shelehov, a merchant trader who laid the foundations of the famous Russo-American Company, landed on Kodiak Island. Besides pursuing his fur-seal business, he became deeply devoted to the task of bringing Christianity to the natives of the newly acquired lands. He built a church on Kodiak, founded a school, and personally baptized many Aleuts. Later, together with his partner Ivan Golikov, he petitioned the Empress Catherine II and the Holy Synod to send missionaries. Their petition was granted. A mission of eight monks, under the leadership of Archimandrite Joasaph Bolotov, reached Kodiak Island on September 24, 1794. That year marked the beginning of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America.⁽¹⁾

During the first two years the missionaries baptized 12,000 natives and built several chapels. The Holy Synod decided to establish a missionary bishopric on the Aleutian Islands. Archimandrite Joasaph was consecrated Bishop of Kodiak in the cathedral of Irkutsk in Siberia on April 10, 1799, but he never reached his see. In May of the same year the Phoenix, the ship on which the new Bishop was returning to Alaska, sank in stormy waters somewhere near Unalaska; Bishop Joasaph and 70 other passengers perished. Another bishop for Alaska was not appointed for 40 years.

Meanwhile, the missionary work was carried on by the remaining monks who had come with Archimandrite Joasaph. They were the hieromonk Athanasy, hierodeacon Nektary, and the monk German.

The last and the most modest of these missionaries, Father German, the blessed Elder of Alaska, is an image of holiness and spirituality shining upon us through a century and a half of the

growth and development of the Orthodox Church in this part of the world.

Like St. Seraphim of Sarov, he was born in a modest merchant family of a little town near Moscow. From his youth he aspired to the service of God. He entered one of the branches of the famous Holy Trinity monastery, which had been founded by St. Sergius of Radonezh. Seeking a quieter and more secluded place, he went to the Valaam monastery in the Far North of Russia. There he joined the Alaskan mission of Father Joasaph.

An extremely simple man who nevertheless was well read and eloquent, he emanated love and understanding. For the natives, Father German was the very symbol of Christianity, while a one-time administrator of the Russian colonies in North America, Si-meon Yanovsky, a well-educated man and a ranking naval officer, was so deeply influenced by Father German that he ended his life as a monk. Yanovsky's son, who as a baby had sat in Father German's lap, became a hieromonk. We owe much to Yanovsky for our information about Father German.

However, not all administrators and merchants in the Russian colonies here were as noble and pious as Yanovsky and She-lehov. Yanovsky's successor, Baranov, and his lieutenants, did not care for the missionary work. In fact, they were much annoyed by the interference of the missionaries and especially of Father German in their cruel use of the natives' labor.

Father German ended his life in semi-seclusion on a small island, "Elovy," which he called "New Valaam," off Kodiak, in 1837.

New impetus was given to the missionary work by the arrival of a young priest, John Veniaminov, to Unalaska Island in 1824. He remained there for ten years, living among the Aleuts and studying their language and customs. He wrote the first grammar of the Aleut language and translated the Divine Liturgy, Catechism, and Gospel according to St. Matthew into that language. His linguistic work has been well recognized by Russian and foreign scholars.⁽²⁾ He also built a church on the island with his own hands, and baptized practically the whole population of the Island. After ten years of tedious missionary work at Unalaska and nearby islands, Father Veniaminov went to Sitka, where he continued his

missionary activities among another people, the Kaloshi. In 1839 he left for St. Petersburg to arrange for the publication of his works in the Aleut language.

During his stay in St. Petersburg, Father Veniaminov's wife passed away. His missionary work was well appreciated in Russia, and as a result he was appointed and consecrated Bishop of the missionary diocese of Kamchatka, Alaska, and the Kurile Islands. His monastic name was Innocent, after the apostle of Siberia. Bishop Innocent returned to Sitka and continued his missionary activities both on the Asiatic and North American continents. He founded a seminary in Sitka, as well as various schools and orphanages. In 1848 St. Michael's Cathedral was erected in Sitka; it still stands and serves as the seat of the Bishop of Alaska. From 1852 Bishop Innocent was dividing his time between Alaska and the Asiatic mainland because of the expansion of missionary work among natives of the Russian Far East. From 1858 to 1870 Sitka was designated as the see of a suffragan bishop. Bishops Peter (1859-1867) and Paul (1867-1870) occupied this see. In 1868 Bishop Innocent was elevated to the highest office in the Russian Orthodox Church, that of Metropolitan of Moscow. Much of his time and energy in this office he devoted to the expansion of the work of the Russian Imperial Missionary Society, the president of which he became. He died in 1879.⁽³⁾

In 1867 the Russian government sold Alaska to the United States. Provisions were stated in the second and third clauses of the bill of sale and in the Declaration of 1867, that the United States would recognize the property and the rights of the Russian Orthodox Church.⁽⁴⁾

On a suggestion of Metropolitan Innocent, in 1870 a separate diocese was created by the Holy Synod from the American part of the Kamchatka diocese. Bishop John was appointed Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands.

Here ends the pre-history of the Orthodox Church in America. Actually, Russian missionary endeavors among the natives of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands represent just the most eastern penetration of the vast missionary work of the Russian Church among various native tribes in the underdeveloped regions of Siberia and the Far East. They did not affect directly the growth and development of Orthodoxy in the United States.

The first three Orthodox parishes in the United States came into being almost simultaneously and absolutely independently of each other in the late sixties of the last century. The Greek parish in New Orleans and Russian parishes in San Francisco and New York were the first real Orthodox penetration of this country. Actually, these parishes were "international." In the Greek parish of New Orleans the members of the church committee besides Greeks were "Slavs" and "Syrians," while the minutes of the meetings were written in English.⁽⁵⁾ The Russian parishes in San Francisco and New York, supported by the Russian consulates, included many Serbians and Greeks.

These churches tended to the spiritual needs of various Orthodox nationals who happened to have come to the New World. There were members of the diplomatic corps and runaway sailors, solid Mediterranean merchants and penniless adventurers. The church was not for them just a house of prayer but also a place where they could meet someone of their own people, to have a chat about the old country, or to inquire about a job.

Although the Orthodox churches, especially the one in New York, attracted much attention by the American press and society. Orthodoxy was mainly a curiosity, something oriental and exotic. In spite of the efforts of the rector of the New York parish, Father Nicholas Biering, a convert from Roman Catholicism and a former professor of canon law at the Roman Catholic Seminary in Baltimore, the religious life of the parish was rather limited. From 1870 to 1880 there were in this parish 55 baptisms of children, 12 weddings, 14 funerals and only four conversions, two of these being the wife and daughter of Father Biering.⁽⁶⁾

The Orthodox Church was not yet ready to meet the challenge of the West, especially in the setting of the New World.

In 1872 Bishop John unofficially moved the episcopal see from Sitka, Alaska to San Francisco, making the parish which had existed there since 1868 his cathedral church. During the time of his successor, Bishop Nestor (1879-1882), the Russian Church authorities officially sanctioned the transfer of the episcopal see to San

Francisco and thus recognized the potentialities of Orthodoxy in the United States.

After the tragic death of Bishop Nestor in the sea off Alaska, no new appointment to the American Diocese was made until 1888. Life in the newly expanded Diocese was dwindling. Just a very few priests remained in Alaska, and they were old men.⁽⁷⁾

The Russian Church, whose authority over the American mission was undisputed at that time, had not maintained the same active interest in the Christianization of the natives of Alaska as it had shown in the time of Archbishop Innocent, nor had it any creative vision or working plan for the expansion of the mission in the United States. One of the reasons for this situation was the national character of the Church in Russia and its close connection with the state, which limited the Church's interest almost entirely to Russians or residents of the Russian Empire. (The initial success of the Russian Orthodox mission in Japan must be attributed personally to Archbishop Nicholas, the head of that mission).

X Another reason for these conditions was the rigidly conservative makeup of the Russian clergy caused by their specific upbringing and education. This made it difficult for them to integrate themselves into a foreign milieu. Many Russian priests, upon their arrival in a foreign country, instead of learning the language, culture and customs of the people of that country, would hide in the ghettos of their parishes and would shut the door to the outside world. Many of their parishioners would lead a double life — religious life in the "ghetto" and secular life in the outside world. Some of them would little by little drift away from the Church. The non-Orthodox people would have almost no chance to develop sufficient interest to join such a religious organization. In many Russian parishes outside of Russia such conditions prevail until today.

Fortunately, there were exceptions to this situation. Bishop Vladimir, for example, who occupied the San Francisco see from 1888 until 1891, learned the English language himself, preached in English, and urged his clergy to learn it.⁽⁸⁾

The real growth of the diocese in the United States began with the mass return of the Uniates to Orthodoxy and the increase of Greek, Syrian, and Slavic immigration. Toward the end of the nineteenth century many Carpatho-Russians and Galicians from Russia Rubra in the Austro-Hungarian Empire emigrated to America. They settled around the industrial centers of the Eastern states and, mostly, in the Pennsylvania mining districts. By religious affiliation they were Roman Catholic of the Eastern Rite, or more precisely, Uniates. Their ancestors were Eastern Orthodox who lived under the Polish and Austrian Roman Catholic governments. Under an agreement in 1595 over 10,000,000 people were received into the fold of the Roman Catholic Church while retaining the Eastern Orthodox liturgy and customs, including the married parish clergy.

A large colony of Uniates settled in Minneapolis, Minnesota, where they organized a parish and engaged a priest from their native country, Father Alexis Toth. However, the Roman Catholic Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, who had jurisdiction over Minneapolis, refused to grant the local Uniates permission to have their own parish and also refused to recognize Father Toth as a valid priest on account of his marriage (although Father Toth was a widower at that time). Having found themselves in such a precarious situation, Father Toth and his parishioners petitioned the Russian Orthodox Bishop in San Francisco, Bishop Vladimir, to accept them into the fold of the Eastern Orthodox Church. In 1891 Father Toth and his parishioners, numbering 361 members, were reunited to the Russian Orthodox Church. This event laid the foundation for the mass return of the Uniates in America to Orthodoxy. In the following decades, over 225,000 Carpatho-Russian and Galician Uniates became Orthodox.⁽⁹⁾

It must be noted that the incident of the non-recognition of Father Toth by a Roman bishop because of his marital status by no means was the only reason for the return of former Austro-Hungarian subjects to Orthodoxy. Many of them had innate feelings of oppression by the Roman Catholic state and longed for Moscow as the symbol of the Orthodox faith of their forefathers and of

their Orthodox-Slavic national aspirations. This feeling, as we shall see, played an important part in the events in the Church during and after the Second World War.

Since the end of the last century there had been an increasing flow of immigrants from Imperial Russia. These were of three kinds: peasants from the poorer western regions of Russia who had a dream of making money in America, where everybody could easily get rich, and of then returning to buy a farm in eheir native country; conscripts who illegally left Russia to avoid military service; and people who were involved, directly or indirectly, in the revolutionary movement in Russia and who escaped to America to avoid the consequences. The last category of immigrants especially increased after the political distrubances of 1905 in Russia.

The Greek immigration to this country also increased considerably in the eighties and nineties of the last century. By 1893 there were already two Greek parishes in New York City: Holy Trinity, with its priests coming from Athens, and Annunciation, whose priests were sent from Constantinople. (Relations between the two parishes were strained).

There were Greek parishes in New Orleans, Chicago, Lowell, Mass., and in the next decade in many other American cities.

At first all Greek parishes recognized the jurisdiction of the Russian bishop, and the Russian Church was the only recognized Orthodox Church in America. However, the national feelings on both sides led to an early violation of the basic Orthodox canonical concept of one bishop and one church on one territory. In 1903-04 the Greek Holy Trinity parish in New York became legally the private property of three Greek residents in order to avoid being under the jurisdiction of the Russian Church.

In 1905 the "Hellenic Eastern Christian Orthodox Church" was incorporated in the State of New York, and thus, as one of the Greek church historians uncaningly points out, "The Greek Church in America was saved from the Russian Jurisdiction."⁽¹⁰⁾

However, until the upheavals caused by the Russian revolution of 1917 the jurisdictional situation of the Greek parishes in America was not quite clear. Many of them actually had double loyalty, recognizing the authority of the Church of Greece or of Constanti-

nople and that of the Russian bishop at the same time. Until 1918 there were no Greek bishop in America, and the Russian bishop tended to the needs of all Orthodox people here.

After the Greek and Russian (which also included other Slavic elements) Church organizations, the Syrian comes next in size and chronology. The immigration from Syria and Lebanon also began toward the end of the 19th century and intensified around 1913-14.

The first church for Arabic-speaking Orthodox Christians in the United States was founded in 1895 in New York. Archimandrite Raphael Hawaweeny, who received his higher theological education in Russia, was placed in charge of the Church's work for Syrians. In 1904 he was consecrated as Vicar-Bishop to the Russian Archbishop and became the first Orthodox Bishop of any nationality to be consecrated in the United States. ⁽¹¹⁾

From 1898 to 1907 the head of the American diocese was Archbishop Tikhon, who became later Patriarch of Moscow, Primate of all the Russian Orthodox Church.

Two outstanding events took place during his administration. In 1900 the Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and Alaska was renamed the Diocese of the Aleutian Islands and North America. The decree of the Holy Synod making this change thus acknowledged the continent-wide expansion of Orthodoxy.

In February of 1907 the First All-American Church Sobor convened in Mayfield, Pennsylvania. In his convocation address, Archbishop Tikhon stressed the necessity of finding means for financial independence and self-support for the Diocese as a necessary step in strengthening and spreading the work of the Church on this continent. ⁽¹²⁾ That was a hint of the impending autonomy of the local church. A year before, in 1906, Archbishop Tikhon in his memorandum to the "Pre-Sobor Council" of the Church of Russia recommended a wider autonomy for the American Diocese. ⁽¹³⁾

Also in Archbishop Tikhon's time the diocesan see was transferred from San Francisco to New York in 1903, where a new cathedral church was built at 15 East 97th St. The first theological seminary to train Orthodox priests for America was opened at

Minneapolis in 1905. It was transferred to Tenafly, N.J. in 1912 and closed for lack of funds in 1923.

Unfortunately the Holy Synod did not pay serious attention to the educational problems in its American Diocese. The academic level in the above-mentioned school was very low, and it could not stand any comparison with the established theological institutions of other denominations in the United States. ⁽¹⁴⁾

By 1907 the Diocese grew to include 86 parishes and 77,000 faithful. ⁽¹⁵⁾

With the tenure of Archbishop Eudokim (Meshchersky) (1914-17) ends the peaceful development of the Church in America. During all the previous years of her life on this continent, the American Mission had a definite canonical position, being a diocese of the Russian Church, subordinated to the Holy Synod and administered by bishop appointed by the Synod. The diocesan administration received annual financial support from the Russian government. However, the Revolution of 1917 changed the life of the Church in Russia radically.

4.

Just before the Communists seized power, during the short term of the ill-fated democratic regime of Alexander Kerensky, the Russian Orthodox Church held its historical national convention, the so-called All-Russian Local Sobor, in Moscow (1917-18). The Sobor put an end to the "synodal structure," elected a head of the Church, the Patriarch, and established new structures of church government in conformity with ancient church canons and the principles of Orthodox ecclesiology. Active preparations for the Sobor had already begun in 1906.

"The Moscow Sobor simultaneously designated both the return to the original Orthodox forms of Church organization" (the restoration of the Patriarchate, regular Sobors, freedom of the Church from the authority of the Procurator, reorganization of the parish), and "the courageous encounter with the on-rushing

future:" the incarnation of the eternal and unchangeable truth of the Church under new and different conditions of life. As the foundation of the whole administrative reform, an ancient canonical principle was restored: that of the Church electing its pastoral leaders, thus returning the laity to its organic place in the body of the Church. It is the teaching of Orthodoxy that the Church is the organic unity of the episcopate, clergy, and people, in which "there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations but it is the same God which worketh all in all. But now are they many members, but yet one body." "In the reestablishment of this canonical order within the Russian Church, greatly merited by the first constituent assembly (1917-18), the beginning of sobornost in this system was instituted from top to bottom." (16)

Archbishop Tikhon, one-time head of the North American Orthodox Diocese, was elected the new Patriarch. After the All-Russian Sobor, the Church emerged inwardly strengthened, purified, and ... by Divine Providence made ready to sustain the most cruel persecutions which were soon to follow.

The North American and Aleutian diocese was represented at the Moscow Sobor by its Archbishop Eudokim, Father Leonid Turkevich (now Metropolitan Leonty) and Father Alexander Kukulovsky (now retired in Los Angeles). The latter two brought back to America the decisions and the spirit of the Sobor, which, as Father Schmemmann wrote, "became the source of further development of local church life. If in Russia itself many of the decisions of the Sobor were not carried out, (persecutions began and the Church of Russia prepared to be the witness of Christ with the blood of martyrs), then in America the Sobor brought its full fruit. It became the last gift and blessing to the American flock from the Mother Church." (17)

The Russian Revolution had a disastrous impact on the American Orthodox life. All normal connections between the Diocese and the highest church authority ceased. Financial support from Russia stopped. The local church life was torn by financial difficulties, personal ambitions, insubordination, human passions, and political and national arguments.

In order to understand all these complexities which arose at that time, one must realize several important facts about the Orthodox people in this country: 1) the impact of the American way of life and of the American conception of democracy on the Orthodox (or former uniate) immigrants who came here from non-democratic environments; 2) their generally low intellectual and educational level; 3) the very inadequate education of the priests; 4) the complete religious freedom in America — loyalty to churches based on free will only; 5) the presence of some political refugees among Orthodox immigrants, associated with the leftist movement in Russia; 6) old national sympathies, prejudices and hatreds brought here from the old countries.

All these factors were vital in the turmoils which engulfed the life of the Slavic immigrants in general, and of the Russian Diocese in particular.

Certain difficulties arising from the factors mentioned above had already taken place here and there years before the Revolution. These found expression especially in the strained relations between pastors and parishioners, and in insubordination to the church authorities. For example, here are quotations from the letter of the monk-priest Gregory, rector of a church in Hartshorne, Indiana Territory, written on October 17, 1906:

“My presence here among rude and feelingless former uniates I consider meaningless. (The style and wording of the letter in Russian indicates that Gregory was a little-educated man.)... Lately they have shown insincerity, hypocrisy, lack of confidence and animosity towards the priest. All that became clear at the wedding of Andrey Yakoubich, who had requested your Grace's permission for marriage, but was denied it... (the Roman Catholic priest) also refused, then they exchanged vows according to the American law in court. The wedding party was interrupted by a fight and shooting... At night they drove a barrel of beer to the doors of the rectory (to mock the priest), which was found by the policemen in the morning...”⁽¹⁸⁾

Priest-monk Yoaniky from Passaic, New Jersey, to Archbishop Tikhon, also in 1906 (day and month illegible):

“... I don't know what they (parishioners) are going to do to me. I think they are going to do some dirty thing,

something in the manner they were doing to other monk-priests and single secular priests. You can expect everything from them... The secretary Volchok almost had beaten me, he started to shout at me madly... I humbly beseech your Grace to transfer me somewhere else.”⁽¹⁹⁾

With the approach of the Russian Revolution during the First World War, tensions among the Russian immigrants increased. Especially significant in this respect is the presence in the United States of some active revolutionaries who later played an important part in the Russian Revolution — Leon Trotsky, for example.

In the church circles this revolutionary mood expressed itself in various kinds of insubordination of clergymen to central church authorities, even to the point of breaking from the established diocese and creating new independent church bodies. Thus, on February 7, 1917, we can find an article in the Russian newspaper published in New York, **Rusky Golos**, about the “growth of the independent Orthodox Russian church in America.” According to this article signed by three priests,⁽²⁰⁾ this new ecclesiastical organization included 5,000 followers with three Russian-Ukrainian parishes in Chicago.

Besides the Russian Socialist Party (a branch of the American Socialist Party), there were various local professional workers’ organizations formally or informally connected with or influenced by the Russian Socialist Party, which later wholeheartedly accepted the Communist revolution. These organizations naturally had a negative attitude toward religion and the Church. Actually there was very little contact between church people and these organizations. Immigrants who organized Russian Orthodox parishes were not interested in Marxist ideology. The majority of them were nationalistically minded and had some vague Pan-Slavic ideals. Their attitude toward the social order was influenced by American democracy, which they understood as freedom from all kinds of authority. Again, one should not forget the cultural and educational background of these people.

People who belonged to leftist political organizations were disposed against religion and church. They organized antireligious meetings and severely attacked the Church, her hierarchy and clergy, in their press. With the approach of the Russian Revolution, their efforts to win church people to their side and to split and

destroy the organized Orthodox church in America became more and more active. There are numerous proofs of that in contemporary newspapers, owned or influenced by leftist organizations. We can find in them direct anti-religious articles, smear campaigns against the central church authority and the hierarchy, information about various local meetings with anti-religious or anti-clerical discussions, and at the same time, full support of those clergymen and laymen who, under pretext of representing the true Orthodoxy, fought against the established Diocese and tried to split it.

Here are some excerpts from the local news printed in 1917, in *Novy Mir*, a newspaper published by the Russian Socialist Publishing Society, in New York.

"New Haven, Conn. The Union of Russian Workers will have a meeting Sunday, February 11, in the Socialist Hall, 129 George Street, corner of Church. There will be a lecture on the subject, "Truth about god." Lecturer Comrade S. Zorin is from New York. Beginning at 2 P. M. Admission free."

"March 10, Ansonia, Conn. The Russian branch of the Socialist Party is having a lecture on the subject, "Religion and State," lecturer Comrade Zorin. After lecture, free discussion. A priest from the local Orthodox church is invited as an opponent in the discussion."

On March 15, in the same newspaper, we can find what happened at this meeting:

"... Lecturer Zorin had tremendous success... There were 300 people. The priest did not come. He is leaping in his church like a gone-crazy devil, cursing socialists and all those who follow them... He appealed to the members of the Brotherhoods to unite in the struggle against socialists, because they soon will take care of us."

In the same issue, under the heading, "A church choir walks out," it is said that in Garfield, New Jersey, young people, members of the church choir, refused to sing in the church any more as a protest against the greedy priest.

At the end of march, American-Russian newspaper brought news of the Revolution in Russia, the abdication of the Emperor, and the assumption of power by the Provisional Government (first

headed by Prince Lvov, and later by Kerensky). The leftist newspapers were full of excitement and bright hopes, and attacks against the church. On March 25, in the Royal Hall of Philadelphia a mass meeting with Leon Trotsky took place. The announcement in **Novy Mir** informed that he would leave for Russia in a few days. The meeting was sponsored by the Russian Branch of the Socialist Party, Society of Assistance to Political Exiles, Lithuanian and Estonian Branches of the Socialist Party. In addition to Russian, lectures were delivered in Yiddish, Lithuanian, Estonian, German and English.

Such meetings and lectures were organized in various places where Slavic immigrants lived, especially in the industrial centers of the Eastern seaboard states.

This revolutionary mood touched church people in a different way. They did not care for a socialist revolution or for Marxist ideology, or for the establishment of a proletarian State. They received news of the revolution as a call to fight against all authorities. Amid this general background, cleverer and more ambitious people, but not very scrupulous ones, wanted to use the situation for their own real or imaginary benefit. The church situation was furthermore aggravated by the fact that the Diocese was actually headless, the ruling Archbishop Eudokim being absent. He went to the Moscow Sobor and never returned, joining the Living Church movement in Russia. Bishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) of Canada, his deputy, remained temporarily in charge of the Diocese.

Here are some facts which can illustrate what was going on at that time, taken from the Russian daily **Russky Golos** for 1917:

September 19. Appeal of Rev. Vasily Kurdiumov to all Russian people of Philadelphia urging them to take over all church properties from the bishops: "Be brave, loyal to each other and strong! Remember the wonderful and truthful words from the Battle March, 'We all came from the people, we all are the children of the aborning family, the brotherly union and freedom — that is our battle slogan!'"

November 5. A meeting of the "progressive party" of the Orthodox clergy took place in New York City on October 31. Rev. John Kedrovsky was the chairman of the meeting. They decided

to propose radical church reforms to the coming Sobor, e. g., married bishops, permission for second marriages for priests.

It is interesting to observe that these reforms which were carried out by the "Living Church" in Russia only several years later were already in 1917 proposed in America by Rev. J. Kedrovsky, who later became a bishop of the Living Church in New York.

January 30, 1918. "Half a year passed since the time when Orthodox parishioners of Winnipeg, aroused by the Revolution in Russia, decided to overthrow the yoke of the synodal administration," begins an article on the church situation in Winnipeg. It continues in a mocking manner as an appeal to the pastor, "We beseech your kindness not to trouble yourself with the administration of the parish and to allow your servants to be in charge of that which they have acquired themselves."

In the same issue, a monk-priest, Peter Solovey, threatens Bishop Alexander, who suspended him for misconduct, and appeals to the Orthodox people, urging them to disobey the hierarchy: "Russian people! Don't be afraid of the Bishop's threats. Their days are counted. They feel the approach of doom, when they will have to face the chosen ones of the people."

A Pre-Sobor resolution of the St. Nicholas parish in Chester, Canada, is printed in the February 1, 1918, issue. This resolution demands from Bishop Alexander in a very rude way more democracy and reminds the Bishop that all Church properties must belong to the people. In the March 30, 1918, issue, the Editor, Ivan Okuntzov, devotes his editorial article to the church situation in America. He laments that the church convention, planned for March, 1918, is again postponed, and attributes it to the reactionary motives of the hierarchy. He outlines the demands of the "people" for the future organization of the church: the elective principle on all levels of the church authority, organization of people's centers, and discussions, meetings, lectures. "With the revolutionary hurricane," he writes, "the masses of faithful have arisen too and have started to speak with an authoritative voice. The Moscow Sobor has been convened. Church reforms benefiting the people have started. Until now 'American Russia', which has financially supported the Orthodox Mission and its leaders, has not raised her voice. She has kept silent, moaning and praying. Actually 50,000

men have been ruled by a small group of people, headed by a bishop, in a basement on 97th Street." (St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York).

To these facts we can add a little-known event of the closing and selling of an Orthodox church in Toronto in 1919, by the members of the parish. They regarded belief in God and the new revolutionary ideas as incompatible.⁽²¹⁾

In this extremely difficult situation the diocesan leaders, bearing in mind the heritage of the Moscow Sobor, called a general convention in Cleveland, Ohio, on February 25, 1919, known as The Second All-American Sobor.⁽²²⁾

The convention heard the reports of American delegates to the Moscow Sobor, Fathers Leonid Turkevich and Alexander Kukulevsky, officially received information of the non-return to the United States of Archbishop Eudokim, and in agreement with the new laws of election of diocesan bishops promulgated at the Moscow Sobor, elected Bishop Alexander as Primate of North America. Patriarch Tikhon elevated him to Archbishop by the recommendation of the convention. The Cleveland convention also established a Council of Presbyters which had control over the Archbishop and Consistory. This short-lived institution expressed rather well the revolutionary mood brought about by the great Russian upheaval.

Unfortunately, Archbishop Alexander was unable to create peace and to consolidate various factors of destruction in and about the Church. Moreover, he got entangled in a critically disastrous financial situation, resigned from his position of ruling archbishop, and left for Europe.

The grave situation was alleviated by the return in 1921 to America of one of the highest hierarchs of the Russian Church, Metropolitan Platon (Rozhdestvensky). Born in 1866, mag. theol., former rector of Kiev graduate school of theology, consecrated bishop in 1902, former exarch of Georgia, Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa, a member of the Duma (Russian Parliament), he had ruled the American diocese from 1907 to 1914, and consequently was well known to his people. He succeeded in restoring peace and order in the diocese, and prominent churchmen of the

diocese urgently petitioned Patriarch Tikhon to reappoint him formally as head of the diocese.

Communications with the Patriarch at that time were extremely difficult, almost impossible. They could be carried through indirect, illegal channels only. Communication thus received from the Patriarch indicated his willingness to relieve Metropolitan Platon of his Kherson and Odessa see and to confirm him as the ruling bishop of America.

The third All-American Sobor held in Pittsburgh, Pa., on November 25-27, 1922, requested the Metropolitan to rule the diocese, and, at the same time decided to postpone final confirmation of its decision to next Sobor in hope of better contact with the Patriarch.⁽²³⁾

Meanwhile, Patriarch Tikhon made the appointment of Metropolitan Platon orally through Mr. Colton, a representative of the Y. M. C. A., who was in Moscow, in the presence of Rev. Theodore Pashkovsky, who later became Bishop of Chicago with the name of Theophilus, and after the death of Metropolitan Platon succeeded as the ruling archbishop. After his release from the prison, Patriarch Tikhon confirmed this oral appointment by the Ukaz dated September 29, 1923. The authenticity of this Ukaz was under question. However, the authenticity of this Ukaz is confirmed now by an article of A. Kazem-Bek about the court-case of St. Nicholas Cathedral in New York printed in the Journal of Moscow Patriarchate 1957, No. 6.⁽²⁴⁾

In March 1924, a document, dated February, 1924, appeared in the local press, purporting to have been issued by the Patriarch, accusing Metropolitan Platon of engaging "in public acts of Counter-Revolution directed against the Soviet State and with disastrous consequences to the Orthodox Church." It provided for the dismissal of Platon "from the day on which this present decision is announced to him," by a new ruling bishop, who was to be chosen.

In the same month of March, John Kedrovsky commenced an action in court, in order to gain control of St. Nicholas Cathedral, claiming that he was the lawful archbishop of the North American diocese. His appointment was made by the schismatic

church group in Russia known as the "Living Church," or "Renovated Church."

The Bolsheviks were trying to destroy the church not only by pressure from outside, but also from within. They supported the formation of a progressive group in the church, loyal to the Soviet government. This group, which consisted of idealists, innovators, but chiefly of opportunists, sought to introduce some changes in the centuries-old structure of the church (permission for bishops to be married, permission for clergy to enter into a second marriage, adoption of the new calendar, etc.) But most of all they sought the favor of the Soviet government, which used them as a tool for splitting the church. This group supported, by the government, proclaimed itself as the rightful Russian Orthodox Church, deposed Patriarch Tikhon and his synod, and summoned their own Sobor of 1923. The minutes of this Sobor contain frequent obsequious expressions of praise of and devotion to the Soviet government.⁽²⁵⁾ Patriarch Tikhon later referred to the members of this Sobor as "ambitious and wilfull men" who took advantage of the situation "to usurp the highest clerical power of the Russian Orthodox Church, which did not belong to them"; he excommunicated them and denounced their statements as "nothing but lies and deception."⁽²⁶⁾

The March, 1924, action of Kedrovsky against Metropolitan Platon's administration was his second attempt against the Diocesan authorities. His first action was commenced in the State of New York in 1918 on behalf of himself and a group of priests against the Archbishop and Consistory. At that time he claimed that Archbishop Alexander unlawfully assumed the leadership in the Diocese in the absence of Archbishop Eudokim.

7.

In this perplexed and confused situation the members of the Diocese called and held the Fourth All-American Church Sobor in Detroit in April of 1924.

By that time it became obvious that direct dependence on the Highest Church Authority in Moscow was impossible. The Patriarch

did not have the freedom to communicate with the outside world. In America, Kedrovsky intensified his action against the Diocese. In view of all this, the Sobor in Detroit proclaimed the Russian Orthodox Diocese in America to be temporarily an autonomous church until the convocation of an All-Russian Sobor.⁽²⁷⁾ At the head there was to be an elected Archbishop, a Council of Bishops, a Council made up of representatives from the clergy and laity, and finally, periodic All-American Sobors.⁽²⁸⁾ The Detroit Sobor also confirmed the election of Metropolitan Platon, and requested him to work out a system of rules for the administration of the American Church in conformity with Orthodox tradition, and to inform the Patriarch of Moscow and other Eastern Churches as to what had taken place.⁽²⁹⁾

This was in conformance literally and in spirit with the decrees of the Moscow Sobor concerning the election of the Ruling Bishop, the administration of a diocese and the decision of the Moscow Sobor concerning the break-down of the Russian Church into Metropolitan Districts. The North American Diocese was mentioned there and by Patriarch Tikhon earlier as a desired district.⁽³⁰⁾ Also it was in absolute conformance with the decree of Patriarch Tikhon dated November 20, 1920, No. 362, issued by the Holy Synod and Higher Church Council. This document contained "instructions to the Diocesan Bishop in the event that a given Diocese be severed from the highest Church Administration, or in case the latter's activity stops." It was provided in part that "if the highest Church Administration... would for any reason discontinue its church-administrative activity," the diocesan bishop, either with the bishop of neighboring dioceses or, if that were not possible, alone, should "assume the full hierarchical power" and "do everything possible to regulate the local church life, and if necessary... organize the diocesan administration suitable to conditions created." Other paragraphs provided for continuation of such local administration of the church, if the discontinuance of activity of the highest Church Administration "should acquire a protracted or even permanent character." A diocesan bishop is advised to divide his see into several dioceses, to give suffragan bishops full rights, and to name new bishops. Finally it was provided that "all measures that were taken locally in accordance with the present instructions ...must be submitted for confirmation later to the Central Church Authority when it is re-established."⁽³¹⁾

The claim of Kedrovsky to the Diocesan property carried to the New York Supreme Court and was decided on December 24, 1924, in favor of Metropolitan Platon.

Kedrovsky appealed this decision, and in October 1925, the Appellate Division of the New York Supreme Court reversed it, holding Kedrovsky to be lawfully appointed and restraining Metropolitan Platon from further use of St. Nicholas Cathedral. This church became the seat of "Archbishop" John Kedrovsky, who became entrenched there with his followers — some defrocked priests and a few scores of ignorant people. All of the Russian churches in America continued to recognize Metropolitan Platon as their spiritual head. Upon loss of his cathedral, Metropolitan Platon accepted the kind offer of Trinity Episcopal Church to hold services in its chapel of St. Augustine at Houston Street. This chapel was divided into two; one was consecrated in 1926 as St. Mary's Pro-Cathedral of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America. In 1943 St. Mary's Pro-Cathedral parish moved to its own building on Second Street.

The decisions of the Detroit Sobor are the foundation upon which the American Russian Diocese once again found peace and unity and upon which she was able to continue her development. However, the disturbances of the established church life caused by the Russian Revolution signaled the rapid disintegration of the American Orthodox Diocese, which had been at least outwardly united under the authority of one ruling bishop, into distinctively separate national jurisdictions. Most of these also experienced great inner crises.

8.

In 1918 Archbishop Meletios of Athens visited the United States with the intention of consolidating the various Greek factions here into one Diocese. He left his companion, Bishop Alexander, to accomplish the task.⁽³²⁾

However, in 1920 during political disturbances, Archbishop Meletios was deposed from his throne in Athens and was forced

to flee to America. Here he became head of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, which he had created. The ecclesiastical authorities in Athens did not recognize Archbishop Meletios and ruled the Archdiocese uncanonical. However, the following year Archbishop Meletios was elected to the dignity of Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople as Meletios IV.

In his new position, Patriarch Meletios promptly revoked the Patriarchal Decree of 1908, which had placed all Greek churches abroad under the jurisdiction of the Church of Greece, and instead placed them under the control of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. This decree was directed not just to the Greeks in the Diaspora, but to all Orthodox people there. It was based on Canon 28 of the Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon, which stated that all Orthodox people in the "barbarian lands" should be under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople; the new decree therefore placed all Orthodox parishes outside the local autocephalous churches in Europe, America and elsewhere under the authority of the Ecumenical Patriarch. According to the definition of the Patriarch, all Orthodox churches in the United States were to be united into an "Orthodox Archdiocese in America."⁽³³⁾

Patriarch Meletios was free of narrow nationalistic aspirations. He had an inspiring and broad vision of Orthodoxy. In his enthronement address in Constantinople, he said in reference to America:

"I saw the largest and best part of the Orthodox Church in the Diaspora, and I understood how exalted the name of Orthodoxy could be, especially in the great country of the United States, if more than two million Orthodox people there were united into one church organization, an American Orthodox Church."⁽³⁴⁾

These words must ring in all Orthodox ears. Unfortunately, most of the Church leaders, Greek and Russian alike, have not grown into that kind of true understanding of the Christian Faith and could not see beyond their narrow provincial prejudices.

Unfortunately, the Patriarchal project of the One Church in American did not work out at that time. The Greek Archdiocese itself was plunged into years of controversies and disturbances.

Part of the Greek parishes did not recognize Archbishop Alexander, the Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch, and remained "independent." The situation worsened soon after when Patriarch Meletios was deposed by the Turks in 1923 and the strife in America between the Venizelists and Royalists deepened. Bishop Basil, formerly of Methinas, arrived in America and organized the Royalist faction into an independent diocese, and by 1929 there were 133 parishes under Archbishop Alexander and 50 parishes under Bishop Basil. This bitter split continued until 1930, when Archbishop Damaskinos of Corinth, future Archbishop of Athens and Regent of the Kingdom of Greece, was appointed Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch in America. Archbishop Damaskinos, upon his arrival, sent Archbishop Alexander and Bishop Basil back to Greece and restored order in the Greek Archdiocese. Having accomplished his task, Archbishop Damaskinos returned to Greece and was succeeded by Archbishop Athenagoras, the present Ecumenical Patriarch.

In 1930 the lofty concept of the Greek Archdiocese, as had been defined by Patriarch Meletios, was drastically changed. The new bylaws adopted in that year defined the Archdiocese as distinctively Greek, embracing those Orthodox people in America who use Greek as their liturgical language, and by implication excluding all other Orthodox Christians in America.⁽³⁵⁾

The Syrian Orthodox people in this country also had their share of troubles.

Bishop Raphael, head of the Syrian Mission within the framework of the Russian Diocese, died in 1915. His successor was Bishop Aftimios Ofeish, consecrated in 1917. There were twenty-eight parishes and one mission under his authority.

In 1914 Germanos Shehadi, former Bishop of Zahle, Lebanon, came to this country. He was well known by many Syrians in America, many of whom had emigrated from his Diocese in Lebanon. He started to organize new parishes and by 1924 had a diocese consisting of about twenty-five churches and congregations.

These two parallel Syrian church organizations existed until 1933, when Bishop Aftimios resigned for personal reasons and Bishop Germanos returned to Beirut. At that time the majority of the Syrian parishes of both factions recognized the authority

of Bishop Victor Abo-Assaley, who represented the Patriarch of Antioch in the United States. In 1934 he died, and since 1936 the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese has been headed by Meropolitan-Archbishop Antony Bashir. The Archdiocese includes more than eighty parishes in the United States, Canada and Mexico. Its cathedral is located in Brooklyn, N. Y.⁽³⁶⁾

9.

In 1919, during the Civil War, while northern Russia and Moscow was under the control of the Communist regime and the Red Army, southern Russia was governed by the anti-Communist White Army. The southern Church leaders, cut off from Patriarch Tikhon and the Holy Synod, organized a Temporary High Church Administration, first in Stavropol and later, with the withdrawal of the White Army to the Crimean peninsula, in Sebastopol. When the White Army was forced to abandon the last Russian territory it held, some bishops found themselves with the remnants of that army in Constantinople. This group of emigre bishops, headed by Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev and Galicia, decided to organize a Higher Church Administration abroad and claimed that it was the heir of the Temporary Administration in southern Russia. Soon they had to move from Constantinople, the seat of the Ecumenical Patriarch, to Yugoslavia, where they settled in Sremsk-Karlowitz, and established the Synod of Bishops Abroad, or as it is now called, the Synod of Bishops Outside Russia, which proclaimed itself to be the supreme ecclesiastical authority for all Russian Churches outside of Russia and to be the source of their "canonicity."

This ecclesiastical group, by its political aspirations, was extremely conservative. Among the resolutions of its first convention held in Yugoslavia in November, 1921, we find the following: "And may the Lord God return to the all-Russian throne His Anointed, strong in the love of the nation, the lawful Orthodox tsar of the House of Romanov."⁽³⁷⁾ This resolution aggravated the extremely difficult situation of the Church in Russia and of the Patriarch. On May 3, 1922, Patriarch Tikhon officially stated that refugee hierarchs had no right to speak on behalf of

the Russian Orthodox Church, their pronouncement did not "represent the official voice of the Russian Orthodox Church, and in view of their political character, did not possess ecclesio-canonical character." (38)

Furthermore, he categorically liquidated the Karlowitz Church Administration. At the same time he transferred the administration of all Russian Orthodox churches in Western Europe to Metropolitan Eulogius, who had his headquarters in Paris. (39)

On his way to America, Metropolitan Platon himself participated in the organization of the Church center for the Russian refugees, considering it, of course, to be only a temporary institution for the masses of refugees who needed church guidance.

As mentioned before, the Synod in Karlowitz did not consider itself as a temporary administrative institution and a communication center, but assumed all prerogatives of an autocephalous Orthodox Church. Metropolitan Platon and Eulogius could not agree on such broad authorities of the Synod; that caused many rifts between them and the Synod and finally their complete withdrawal from the Synod.

For the last time Metropolitan Platon attended a convention of the Synod of Bishops in Kalowitz in 1926. At this convention the difference in point of view on church administration became irreconcilable. Metropolitan Platon asked the Synod to give him affidavits testifying to his lawful position as a ruling archbishop in North America, which he needed for his struggle against Kedrovsky. The Synod requested him to sign the statement recognizing the supreme authority of the Karlowitz Administration and disavowing the decisions of the Detroit Sobor, which proclaimed the autonomy of the church in America. Metropolitan Platon left the convention, and Metropolitan Eulogius followed him.

Four of five suffragan bishops and vast majority of clergy and laity in America were behind Metropolitan Platon, 250 parishes were loyal to him. Bishop Apolinarius⁽⁴⁰⁾ of San Francisco did not agree with the Metropolitan. In March of 1927, the Bishops' Synod in Karlowitz suspended Metropolitan Platon and appointed Bishop Apolinarius in his place. Thus another parallel church was organized in America. Although in the beginning only several parishes

joined Archbishop Apolinarius, their number was augmented with the coming to America of displaced persons during recent years.

There is a great psychological difference between the local American-Russian Church and the Diocese of the Bishops' Synod Abroad. The difference remains until now the same as it was in time of Metropolitan Platon and his rival Archbishop Apolinarius. The Church of Metropolitan Platon and its present head Metropolitan Leonty has realized itself as the local church, brought here more than 150 years ago by the Russian missionaries, but now deeply rooted in the American soil. It understands its mission as rooting this church even deeper and spreading its message wider. It understands its task as a permanent assignment given by God to work in this Lord's vineyard of this continent. The bulk of members of this church consists of immigrants who came to this country before the Russian Revolution, and second and third generations Americanized. The majority of clergymen have spent most of their lives in this country. There are more and more priests who were born in this country.

Around the Bishops' Synod Abroad in early twenties assembled people who just had left their motherland with still smoking guns in their hands, and still-bleeding wounds on their bodies. Hatred of the Communists, despair of defeat, hopes for eventual revenge — these were their dominant feelings. In the church they sought strength and inspiration, symbol of unity and a victorious banner for the fulfillment of their earthly patriotic task. All Orthodox churches are not very keen in making distinction between national and religious between heavenly Kingdom and the earthly. The Russian Church was in no way an exception to that. Thus, the Church leaders having found themselves amidst great political and historical upheaval, surrounded by the White Russian generals, former imperial ministers and politicians, princes of the Royal House of Russia, wholeheartedly plunged into emigre politics and aspirations. From that time on the church organization of the Bishops' Synod Abroad is strongly patriotic and nationalistic, very conservative politically, and has no missionary zeal whatsoever. It embodies the idea of Russia abroad. Its main pathos — preserving Russian Orthodoxy and Russian nationality in the non-Orthodox, non-Russian world, until the day when the rule of the Antichrist will end in Russia and they will bring preserved Holy Orthodox

Russian traditions back to Russia. Incidentally, they regard the present official Orthodox Church in Russia as a sacrilegious institution which serves Satan and his power.

10.

In 1933, a former military ordinary of the White Russian Army and one of the founders of the Bishop Synod Abroad, Archbishop Benjamin Fedchenkoff arrived in New York from Paris. His express purpose for coming to this country was a lecture tour. He was received by Metropolitan Platon and other church functionaries with due respect and sincerity. Soon it became known that he was assigned by the Acting Locum Tenens of the Moscow Patriarchal Throne, Metropolitan Sergiy to demand from Metropolitan Platon and his clergy a written pledge of loyalty to the Soviet Power.⁽⁴¹⁾

It was not the first time that Metropolitan Platon was approached with such a request. On March 7, 1928, while being engaged in a judicial struggle with "archbishop" John S. Kedrovsky for possession of St. Nicholas Cathedral, Metropolitan Platon wrote a letter to Metropolitan Sergiy seeking his support in the case. The answer came in a month, on April 29. It contained a request to sign an obligation of non-participation in political activities specially those directed against the Soviet Union and its government. Metropolitan Sergiy also reminded Metropolitan Platon of Decree No. 28 of 1924 (dismissal of Metropolitan Platon for "counter-revolutionary activities"). Metropolitan Platon replied to this letter only on June 27, 1929. He expressed his resentment at being reminded of the interdict. He also promised to give an official answer to the above mentioned request of Metropolitan Sergiy when all Russian bishops of North America convene (at that time the bishop of Alaska was absent).⁽⁴²⁾ Of course, in replying this way Metropolitan Platon just tried to postpone the inevitable break with the Mother-Church. He had always questioned the authenticity of the patriarchal decree No. 28, he realized the extremely precarious position of the patriarchal administration in captivity to the totalitarian state and wanted to preserve a status quo in

ecclesiastical relations between Moscow and the American Diocese. The arrival of Archbishop Benjamin put an end to his efforts.

In 1927, Russian emigre churches in Europe were also requested by Metropolitan Sergiy to give a pledge of non-participation in political activities directed against the Soviet Union. Metropolitan Anthony, head of the Bishops' Synod in Karlowitz, Yugoslavia, refused to sign the pledge. His group assumed that they had all canonical prerogatives of the autocephalous Russian Church and thus they did not worry about their canonical foundation.

Metropolitan Eulogius, head of Russian parishes in Western Europe, who resided in Paris, questioned the canonicity of the Bishops' Synod in Kalowitz. He tried to preserve some connection with the Moscow Patriarchy, even with price of the pledge. He and members of his administration regarded that pledge as a mere formality necessitated by the precarious situation of the Russian church in the Soviet State. When political demands from Moscow had increased, Metropolitan Eulogius and his associated found themselves unable to carry them out. Only the suffragan bishop Benjamin with a handful of followers remained loyal to Moscow. In 1930, Metropolitan Eulogius and those in communion with him were suspended by Metropolitan Sergiy and his Synod. Metropolitan Eulogius appealed to the Ecumenical Patriarch (Patriarch of Constantinople), the primus inter pares among the heads of autocephalous churches and the highest arbitre in conflicts and litigations among bishops. The Ecumenical Throne understood the difficult and specific situation of the Russian Church in the Soviet Union and abroad, and accepted Metropolitan Eulogius with his flock into his fold by creating a temporary Russian Exarchate in Western Europe in the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch.⁽⁴³⁾ At present this exarchate is headed by Bishop Georgiy.

On May 25, 1933, Archbishop Benjamin personally submitted the following pledge to Metropolitan Platon for signing: "I feel that it is my duty to assure Your Eminence (Metropolitan Sergiy), that in my church and public activities in the United States of America, I limit myself only to the affairs directly connected with the Orthodox Mission and the welfare of the church. I will abstain from participating in political life in general and particularly in relation to the Soviet Union."⁽⁴⁴⁾

Metropolitan Platon categorically refused to give any pledge of loyalty to the Soviet State. Furthermore, in his epistle to the faithful of America, of June 3, he reaffirmed the principles of Detroit Sobor of 1924, rejecting administrative submission to the Moscow Patriarchy dependent on a communist anti-religious government and declaring the autonomous status of the diocese in America, pending establishment of normal church life within Russia. The epistle emphasised that this branch of the Russian Church had the intention of remaining Russian religiously, but not politically, and that it still less desires to be connected with the Soviet regime, "which is saturated with communistic and atheistic principles."

In view of Metropolitan Platon's insubordination to the Moscow Patriarchy, Archbishop Benjamin proclaimed himself the new head of the Russian Diocese in America and urged all faithful to unite around him. He also sent a detailed report and a copy of Metropolitan Platon's epistle to Moscow.

On July 9, Deputy Patriarchal Locum Tenens, Metropolitan Sergiy, replied with the Epistle addressed to the "Acting Exarch of the Moscow Patriarchy in America" Archbishop Benjamin and "all Godloving clergy and laymen" who followed him. In his epistle Metropolitan Sergiy gives a complete account of relations between Metropolitan Platon and the Moscow Patriarchy; he warns the faithful to avoid communion with "schismatics" and admonishes the latter to repent and return into the fold of the loving Mother-Church. He also informs them of the pending meeting in August of the Patriarchal Holy Synod which was going to examine the case of Metropolitan Platon.

The meeting took place in Moscow on August 16, 1933. The Patriarchal Synod condemned Metropolitan Platon and his followers and issued an ukaze (decree) dated August 24, 1933, and signed by Metropolitan Sergiy. The ukaz cancelled the proclamation of autonomy of the Russian Diocese in North America by Metropolitan Platon, appointed Patriarchal Exarch Benjamin as acting ruling bishop of the Diocese, and suspended Metropolitan Platon and all clergy and laymen who followed him, until they submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchy.⁽⁴⁵⁾

In 1934, Metropolitan Sergiy appointed his exarch Benjamin as permanent ruling bishop of the Russian North American Diocese.

The text of the order contained a recital that Archbishop Benjamin had "organized in New York a Diocesan Council and that our North American Diocese has begun official existence."⁽⁴⁶⁾ Actually, Archbishop Benjamin had very meager following. By 1945, the number of parishes which recognized him was only 13.⁽⁴⁷⁾ His headquarters were located at 38 Halsey Street, Brooklyn, where he had a small chapel in his apartment.

Metropolitan Platon died on April 20, 1934. On November 20-23, of the same year the Fifth All-American Church Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America was held in Cleveland, Ohio. The Sobor elected Bishop Theophilus (Pashkovsky) of San Francisco as successor to Metropolitan Platon with the title "Archbishop of San Francisco and Metropolitan of All America and Canada." The Sobor upheld the autonomous way chosen by the late Metropolitan Platon and defined its relation to the Church in the Soviet Union. The Sobor reaffirmed the spiritual bond with the Mother-Church but emphatically refuted any possibility of administrative connection with the church in the totalitarian atheistic state deprived of political freedom.⁽⁴⁸⁾

On January 5, 1933, the Moscow Patriarchy issued a decree suspending Metropolitan Theophilus, and purporting to prohibit him from performing divine service "until either he repents or the ecclesiastical court shall have rendered a decision."⁽⁴⁹⁾

11.

Several other national dioceses were organized in America between the two World Wars: the Serbian, comprising now about 70 parishes headed by Bishop Dionisiye, in the jurisdiction of the Serbian Patriarch; Bulgarian, comprising now about 25 parishes, headed by Metropolitan Andrey, in the jurisdiction of the Bulgarian Exarchate; Albanian, with 15 parishes, headed by Bishop Fan S. Noli; Carpatho-Russian, consisting of about 40 former Uniat parishes, headed by Bishop Orestes Chornock, in the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch.

The Ukrainians first organized a separate diocese in 1932. This diocese, with about 30 parishes headed by Bishop Bohdan Shpilka, is in the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarch.

After the Second World War, with the increase of immigration from Europe, other Ukrainian church organizations developed which have not recognized the authority of Bishop Bohdan. At the present time they are consolidated in the Ukrainian Orthodox Church in the United States of America, affiliated with the independent Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Canada. They claim 90 parishes in the United States, under Archbishop John Theodorovich, and 180 parishes in Canada under Archbishop Hilarion. The validity of John Theodorovich's episcopal consecration is in doubt in the minds of other Orthodox bodies in America.

There is still another small Ukrainian group in America, headed by Archbishop Panteleimon.

The Romanian diocese was organized in 1929. Since 1935 it was headed by Bishop Policarp, sent here by the Holy Synod of Romania. In 1939 Bishop Policarp returned to Romania to attend a meeting of the Holy Synod, and the outbreak of the war prevented his return to his diocese.

After the war the Romanian diocese was engulfed in bitter conflict. At the present time several Romanian parishes are headed by Bishop Moldovan, who considers himself in the jurisdiction of the Romanian Patriarch. The majority of the Romanian parishes, about 50) make up the Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America, headed by Bishop Valerian Trifa. Since 1960 this diocese has been in the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Leonty, head of the Russian Metropolitan District in America.^(5c)

In 1935 on the initiative of the Patriarch of Serbia, Barnabas, heads and representatives of major Russian church groups outside of Russian borders assembled in Szemsky Kalovitz in an attempt to reach an accord. Metropolitan Theophilos, who succeeded the late Metropolitan Platon as the ruling Russian primate in North America, attended the meeting also.

At this Bishops' Sobor the Temporary Status of the Russian Church Abroad was composed. According to this document, the American Russian Metropolia entered into union with three other

Russian Metropolias outside of Russia. Bishops, clergy and parishes of the American Diocese of the Synod of Bishops Abroad entered the Metropolia headed by Metropolitan Theophilos. The Metropolia was at the same time able to preserve its autonomy.

In October of 1937, the Sixth All-American Church Sobor convened in New York. The Sobor reluctantly confirmed the Temporary Status. These are the results of the open balloting: 105 for the Status, 9 against, and 122 abstaining from voting. "The Temporary Status," spoke Metropolitan Theophilos at the Sobor, "has more moral than administrative significance, for it shows our accord and our unity, but it does not bind us."⁽⁵¹⁾

This temporary accord between the American Metropolia and the Russian Synod of Bishops Abroad terminated at the end of World War II.

In 1935 an accord was also reached with Archbishop Adam of Philadelphia, who headed an independent Carpatho-Russian Diocese consisting of about forty parishes in the United States and Canada. The Diocese came into existence as a result of a patriotic national movement among American Carpatho-Russian and Galicians for the liberation of their native lands, known as Russia Rubra, from Austro-Hungarian rule, and the reunion of those lands with Russia. An Alliance for the Liberation of Carpatho-Russia was created, several Carpatho-Russian congresses were held in 1917-1919 with the participation of political leaders from their native country, and petitions were sent to the League of Nations.

Along with these political developments, the Holy Synod found it possible to satisfy the national aspirations of the Ruthenian people and to appoint a special Carpatho-Russian Suffragan Bishop to the American Diocese with the title of Bishop of Pittsburgh. In 1916 a former Uniate priest, Alexander Dzubay, was consecrated bishop under the monastic name of Stephen. During the post-revolutionary crisis in the life of the American Russian Church, Bishop Stephen had acted independently. In 1922 he and Bishop Gorazd from Moravia consecrated Archimandrite Adam Philipovsky as Bishop of Canada. Later Bishop Stephen rejoined the Roman Catholic Church and in 1933 died of a nervous breakdown.⁽⁵²⁾ Adam Philipovsky was born in Galicia in 1881, studied law in Lvov, and was ordained priest in America in 1912. Having

become a bishop, he ruled the parishes loyal to him in the United States and Canada without submitting to any ecclesiastical authority. His agreement with the Metropolia lasted only a few years. His leaning towards complete independence led to an early break.

At the end of World War II he joined the Patriarchal Exarchate in America and was appointed Deputy Exarch. He retired shortly before his death in 1956.

According to an article by Bishop Leonty of Chicago, published in the July 1940 issue of the Harbin monthly **Khleb Nebesny**, the Metropolia numbered at that time 400,000 faithful, divided into 330 parishes and eight dioceses.⁽⁵³⁾

12.

The war between Germany and the Soviet Union which broke out in June of 1941, made a great impact on church life in America. The majority of Russian Orthodox people of all walks of life were deeply touched by the tragic events in the land of their fathers, in land of their church. Their feelings were expressed in the words of the Epistle issued by the Sobor of Bishops of the Russian Metropolia on October 9, 1941:

"Having been separated from our motherland by a great distance, but spiritually being close to her always, we cannot be silent witnesses and passive spectators of the bloody Golgotha of our much suffering people. As our flesh and blood, we have to carry them in our hearts, suffer with their sufferings, weep with their bloody tears and use all our efforts and means to save them..."⁽⁵⁴⁾

From that time on national and political considerations constituted the predominant factor in all subsequent church events. Three distinctively different approaches to the monumental crisis in Eastern Europe manifested themselves:

... A burning desire to see communism in Russia destroyed by all means and at any cost, and a sweet dream of restoration of old Imperial Orthodox Russia.

2. Patriotism either blinded, or compromising, or ignorant in respect to the Soviet Communist authority and aspirations, which drove many Russian Orthodox people in the pro-Soviet camp.

3. Steadfast unacceptance of communism and non-recognition of the Soviet government, careful differentiation between the struggle of Russian people for national and spiritual freedom on the one hand, and the Soviet communist aims on the other, without swaying either towards the Axis powers or towards Moscow.

The first two extreme attitudes immediately became apparent in church circles. Many zealous adherents of the Russian Synod of Bishops Abroad shared the first point of view. At the very beginning of the war Archbishop Vitaly, a prominent leader of the Karlovitz movement in America, signed a petition to the President of the United States with two other representatives of Russian right wing groups. In this petition they asked Franklin Delano Roosevelt to abstain from rendering any help to the Soviet Union in its struggle against the German invaders. "American help to Stalin and his henchmen will be regarded by the subjugated Russian people as a great injustice towards them... All Russians passionately wait for the coming of the blessed hour of their liberation... Russians will not voluntarily fight for Stalin, even if we send them our best military experts and give them the best American equipment. Every American dollar sent to the treasury of the Comintern would be considered by Russians as an attempt by this country to prolong the agony of their miserable existence under the red yoke..."⁽⁵⁵⁾

A number of conservative Russian emigrants with monarchistic aspirations sincerely believed that Germany could crush the Soviet rule and that somehow in the confusion of war a national free Russia would emerge. They did not think much about the essence of the German National Socialism or about the practical feasibility of their dream. There were no intellectuals in their ranks. The majority of them were former White Army officers and men.

Another extreme was represented by the Patriarchal Exarch, the Metropolitan of the Aleutian Islands and North America, Benjamin. Almost forgotten before the Soviet-German war, he immediately became a very prominent and active figure. He used every

opportunity to speak for the Russian people, for the Soviet Government, for the American-Soviet friendship, and violently condemned those who did not share his views. With the growth of American-Soviet cooperation and strong pro-Soviet sympathies here, Metropolitan Benjamin became a familiar figure at various meetings and rallies organized by the Russian War Relief, Inc., the American-Soviet Friendship, the Carpatho-Russian Congress for the Liberation of Russia Rubra, etc.

His position was especially strengthened when the Soviet government allowed the church authorities to fill the patriarchal seat, which was vacant since 1925. On September 4, 1943, the Patriarchal Locum Tenens Metropolitan Sergiy with Metropolitans Nikolai and Alexei were received by Premier Stalin and Foreign Commissar Molotov. On September 8, 1943, eighteen bishops convening in Moscow elected Metropolitan Sergiy as the new Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia.⁽⁵⁶⁾ The election of the Patriarch and a new seemingly favorable Soviet policy towards the church made a great impression not only in Russian circles but in the whole free world. Probably that was one of the main reasons for the new Soviet policy.

The Synod of Bishops Abroad, at a meeting in Vienna held by the Nazis on October 21 of the same year, condemned the patriarchal election in Moscow as unlawful and issued a statement of nonrecognition of the new Patriarch. Their chief argument was the small number of bishops present at the electing convention, the majority of bishops being in prisons and concentration camps.⁽⁵⁷⁾

Metropolitan Theophilus of North America and Canada, in a cautious interview with the Russian American press, called the patriarchal election "beneficial for the welfare of the Russian Church and people, provided the election was free and canonically correct."⁽⁵⁸⁾

Metropolitan Benjamin burst into unrestrained glorification of the election and the new Soviet policy:

"It should be made clear that this does not place any degree of control or restraint upon the Church such as was exercised by the Czar. On the contrary, it guarantees the complete independence of the Church in that separation of Church and State established by the Soviet Constitution.

It was the fulfilment of the constitutional guarantee of religious freedom as regards the Orthodox Church.”⁽⁵⁹⁾

The election of the Patriarch was acclaimed in the British Commonwealth and the United States as a dramatic turning point in Soviet policies, internal and external, and the manifestation of religious freedom in Russia. All leading newspapers and magazines had pictures of the Patriarch and stories of the free church life in the vast Russian land engaged in a mortal struggle with the invading German armies. Many big stores in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, etc., displayed pictures of Stalin and the Patriarch in their windows. Protestants all over the free world greeted the news warmly. In particular the leaders of the Anglican communion, traditionally interested in Orthodoxy, rejoiced at the event. Most of them accepted it without reservations. The Heads of non-Russian Orthodox churches immediately recognized the new Patriarch.

A majority of Russian Orthodox people in America also wholeheartedly accepted the election of the Patriarch. This event, which received so much publicity only strengthened their patriotic feelings kindled by the heroic struggle of the Russian people against the Nazis. Most of them were not political emigrants, so-called “White Russians,” and they did not experience that innate deep revulsion at everything “Soviet.” But there were also some White Russians in this camp, a few former princes and counts. They started to raise their voices in favor of the submission of the local church to the Patriarchal authority. The main reason for the temporary autonomy of the American diocese announced by Metropolitan Platon and reaffirmed by his successors and the All-American Sobors, that the church in Soviet Russia was not free, ceased to exist for them.

The local church leaders were more cautious and objective in their reaction to the ecclesiastical events in the Soviet Union. They were ready to recognize the new Patriarch as the canonical primate of the church in Soviet Russia. The bishops of the North American Metropolia, at their convention of October 26-27, 1943, even decided to elevate the name of the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia at divine services.⁽⁶⁰⁾ However, they questioned his freedom in relation to the state, and were hesitant to accept his administrative authority over them.

After the death of Patriarch Sergiy on May 15, 1944, the name of the Locum Tenens Metropolitan Alexei was elevated at the services in North America churches by the instruction issued by Metropolitan Theophilos and a few days later confirmed by the convention of bishops, May 31, 1944.⁽⁶¹⁾

Meanwhile tensions in and around the church in America were growing. With the victorious surge of the Russian armies westward pro-Soviet sympathies increased in this country. At that time it was not an easy task to remain professedly anti-Soviet in America or in the British countries. All those Russian emigrants or citizens of Russian origin who did not share the common enthusiasm for the Soviet ally or "good old uncle Joe" were often suspected of pro-fascist sympathies, and of disloyalty to the cause of the allies. Thus, for example, in Brisbane, Australia, the rector and all active male members of the Russian Orthodox Church were arrested and interned for the duration of the war. They were loyal British subjects of Australia but definitely anti-communist. Local pro-Soviet sympathizers reported them to the Intelligence Service as pro-Nazi.

Metropolitan Benjamin tirelessly travelled across the country, especially in Pennsylvania, and visited Russian Orthodox parishes outside his own jurisdiction. Everywhere he made fiery speeches, mixing up ideas of Holy Russia and the communist state and urging simple, politically inexperienced people to demand the submission of their church authorities to the Moscow Patriarchy. He was well publicized by the American press. He could be seen often on the pages of various newspapers shaking hands with the Secretary of State, mixing with church dignitaries and high governmental officials at banquets given by the U. S. agencies, civic organizations or the Soviet embassy. His mission in the Russian Orthodox parishes was quite successful. The demand for reunion with Moscow was becoming stronger and stronger. Some parishes even displayed the Red Soviet banner alongside the American flag.⁽⁶²⁾

Some people of Carpatho-Russian and Galician descent in America, whose native lands of Russia Rubra were formerly under Austro-Hungarian rule and after the first World War went under Poland and Czechoslovakia, believed that the time had come to request freedom from foreign domination for their blood brethren, and their reunion with the Russian people of the USSR. The Ame-

rican League of Russians and Carpatho-Russians led the movement.⁽⁶³⁾

There also persisted a group of White-Russians who did not recognize the Patriarch of Moscow or any other member of the official hierarchy in the USSR, and regarded them simply as communist agents dressed in clerical garbs. The elevation of the Patriarch's name at divine services struck them as a gross sacrilege. They condemned all other Eastern Orthodox churches for their recognition of the Moscow Patriarchy. They regarded the Synod of Russian Bishops Abroad (in Karlovitz, Yugoslavia, occupied by Germany, later moved to Munich, Germany) with its head, Metropolitan Anastasios, as the only bulwark of unspoiled Orthodoxy in the world. Incidentally, others charged Metropolitan Anastasios and the Bishops Synod with collaboration with the Nazis.

13.

Such was the psychological situation in which Metropolitan Theophilos and his administration had to lead one of the largest branches of Eastern Orthodoxy in this country. Several important considerations governed their subsequent actions:

1. The preservation and continuity of the American-Russian ecclesiastical tradition, as laid down 150 years ago by the first Russian missionaries in Alaska and embodied in the Russian Missionary Diocese in North America.
2. The preservation of the spiritual tie with the Mother-Church in Russia. Consciously or unconsciously, the church in Russia, regardless of political conditions there, and not the emigre Bishops Synod, was regarded as the source of canonicity by the majority of old-time workers of the Metropolia.
3. The preservation of the full internal autonomy proclaimed by the Detroit Sobor of 1924, and fear of any Soviet political interference with local church life as incompatible with the loyal American citizenship.
4. The preservation of all people and parishes entrusted to their spiritual care by a long line of predecessors. There was serious ap-

prehesion that many parishes might break off from the Metropolia and join the jurisdiction of Metropolitan Benjamin. In fact, there were such cases.

However, the leaders of Metropolia did not find themselves in complete accord on all the above mentioned points. It should be remembered, that since the recognition of the Russian Synod of Bishops Abroad by Metropolitan Theophilos in 1935, the bishops sent here earlier by the Karlovitz organization joined the Metropolia together with their parishes. These bishops and their followers, mostly recent White-Russian emigrants, were practically isolated from the vast majority of local Russian Orthodox old colonists, mostly former uniates and Ruthenians, and they could not understand the problems which beset their brethren in the Metropolia.

In this extremely complicated politico-psychological situation, the Metropolia became entangled in tedious and futile negotiations with the Moscow Patriarchy. The subject of negotiations was the re-establishment of canonical relations between the Metropolia and the Mother Church.

The Patriarchy invited the Metropolia to send its representatives to the local Sobor of the Russian Church held in Moscow from January 31 to February 2. The American delegates arrived in Moscow after the closing of the Sobor through no fault of their own.⁽⁶⁴⁾

The special envoy of the Patriarch, Archbishop Alexei of Yaroslav and Rostov, arrived in the United States to begin the negotiations with the Metropolia.

On November 26, 1945 the All-American Sobor of the Russian Church was convoked in Cleveland, Ohio. This Sobor recognized the spiritual, but not the judicial, authority of the Patriarch of Moscow, advised the bishops to carry on negotiations with Moscow, and reaffirmed the administrative autonomy of the American Church. It also promulgated the withdrawal of the American Metropolia from membership in the Russian Synod of Bishops Abroad.⁽⁶⁵⁾ Since then the Synodical group has become a distinctively separated church organization in America once again.

The Patriarchal Exarchate in America, established in 1933, at that time reached its peak of success by growing to the size of fifty parishes due to defections from the Metropolia and elsewhere.

In the summer of 1947 another envoy of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Gregory of Leningrad and Novgorod, arrived in New York to continue the negotiations.

Neither side was willing to make final concessions. The Patriarchy was willing to grant ecclesiastical autonomy to the local church but insisted on its right to approve the ruling bishop elected by the American Sobor and to maintain appellate jurisdiction over the American bishops in the system of ecclesiastical courts. On the other side, the American negotiators insisted on autonomy which was virtually complete independence, preserving just a token of connection with the Mother Church in the recognition of the purely spiritual leadership of the Patriarch. A stalemate was reached, and Metropolitan Gregory left the United States without accomplishing his mission.⁽⁶⁶⁾

The answer to the proposals of Metropolitan Gregory and an explanation of the stand taken by the American hierarchy came in the middle of November of the same year when the bishops of the Metropolia convened in San Francisco. The resolution of the bishops officially announced their decision "to put off the formulation of any canonical tie of the North American Orthodox Church with the Church and Patriarchy of Moscow for a more propitious time" because it was impossible "at the present time" to reconcile the project of autonomy proposed by Metropolitan Gregory with the one adopted by the Metropolitan Council.⁽⁶⁷⁾

A Pastoral Epistle issued by the same Bishops' Sobor gave the reasons for this resolution:

"The difficult conditions of the times and the special governmental control over all the foreign contracts of the Patriarchy of Moscow do not permit us, at the present time, to have any administrative, judicial or material allegiance to Moscow... The only possibility at present, both for the Russian Church itself and for us, is the strengthening of one another in prayer upon the paths given us by God. In this spiritual recognition of the contemporary Russian Church and of her heroic stand on the Russian Land, we call upon our flock to make constant mention in prayer for all Russia and her First Hierarch..."⁽⁶⁸⁾

Soon a Patriarchal Ukaz dated December 26, 1947, reached America. By this Ukaz Metropolitan Theophilus and the bishops in

his jurisdiction were subject to trial by the Sobor of Bishops in Russia; the interdict laid upon Metropolitan Theophilos in 1935 by the Moscow Patriarchy was left in force with an extension to the other bishops of his jurisdiction. Archbishop Makary was appointed Exarch of the Moscow Patriarchy in North and South America, while former Exarch Metropolitan Benjamin left the United States for the USSR at his own wish and was appointed to the see of Riga.⁽⁶⁹⁾

In spite of the interdict, the Metropolia has continued to follow its chosen path. During the last years of Metropolitan Theophilos' reign the administration of the Russian-American Church was steadily expanding its work: the Seminary in New York was reorganized into a Graduate School of Theology, distinguished Russian scholars were invited from Europe to join its faculty, many well-qualified priests, refugees from Eastern Europe, especially from Poland and Latvia, were accepted into the Metropolia, new churches were built, and assistance was even rendered to the sister Church of Japan.

In 1950 the headquarters of the Russian Synod of Bishops Outside of Russia was transferred to the United States, and Metropolitan Anastasy, the chairman of the Synod, arrived from Munich in New York. This development has intensified the activities of the Synodical jurisdiction in America, and the Synod's claim to an exclusive canonicity and supreme authority. There were also persistent accusations against the Metropolia of a pro-Soviet attitude, by members of the Synodal group.

The Convocation of the Metropolia in December of the same year unanimously adopted the following resolution submitted to the plenum by Bishop John (Shakhovskoy) of Brooklyn (now of San Francisco):

"Whereas, our Russian Orthodox Church in America was founded by the Church of Russia and was part of that Church during all the years of its existence; whereas, after the revolution of 1917, this beneficial contact terminated, the Church under the Soviets was subject to severe persecutions, the Patriarch was imprisoned, and we were deprived of his spiritual guidance... we were forced to establish autonomy at the Sobor in Detroit in 1924, in complete agreement with the Patriarchal Ukaz of Nov. 20, 1920, No. 362; whereas,

during all these years the Russian Orthodox Church in America has continued to pray for the suffering land of Russia and its much-enduring church; whereas... our temporarily independent American Metropolia cannot place itself in any canonical administrative relationship with the Moscow Patriarchy because the latter is unable to express the voice of the Church of Christ freely; and also taking into consideration the fact that the Synod Abroad, which was situated previously in Karlovitz, and lately in Munich, has been transferring its centre of activities to American territory, and having pretensions to the possession of the fulness of Church Authority, is endeavoring to establish it in America; this Sobor does hereby resolve:

(1) To confirm the decision of the Bishops' Council in San Francisco in December of 1947, refuting the request of the representative of the Patriarch of Moscow for submission.

(2) To preserve unchanged the temporary autonomy of our Metropolia in America and Canada, and to continue in the years of the suffering of the Mother Church of Russia to pray for her, elevating at the divine services the petition for "The Most Holy Orthodox Patriarchs and for the bishops of the suffering Church of Russia."

(3) To consider the pretensions of the Karlovitz-Munich Synod and its endeavors to submit the Russian Orthodox Church in America to its authority as having no foundation, leaving these pretensions without satisfaction...

(4) To call upon all Orthodox people to keep the unity of faith, brotherly love and communion in prayer among all the free branches of the Orthodox Church in America and all other countries." (70)

The text of the letter of Metropolitan Anastasy to Archbishop Leonty of December 1, and that of the answer by the newly elected Metropolitan, Leonty, dated December 8, were announced at the Sobor. Metropolitan Anastasy proposed to resume effort for church peace. His proposal was made in general terms without any specific proposals.

Metropolitan Leonty, having welcomed the Synod's chairman to America, pointed out, however, that he and his bishops had arrived on the territory of the local church and that their canonical situation was therefore very precarious. (71)

The Metropolitans exchanged visits, discussed church matters, but were unable to solve the painful problem. The Synod has therefore remained outside the Metropolia and has pursued its own specific cause.

The Synodical Church in America has greatly increased during the last few years due to the arrival of Displaced Persons from Europe and the Far East. At present the North American Diocese of the Synod of Bishops Outside of Russia has about 100 parishes in the United States and Canada which are administrated by several bishops. There is a well-organized monastery in Jordanville, N. Y. and two convents in New Jersey and California under this jurisdiction. The jurisdiction has continued to be thoroughly Russian, politically very conservative, and has no desire or ability for missionary work. It is distinctively the church of the emigrants and not of the immigrants. However, it claims to be the only true Orthodox Church, the only "canonical" church. Others (including the Metropolia) are either "pro-Soviet" and "bowed to the Beast," i. e., in any degree of recognition of the Moscow Patriarchy and the hierarchy of the Church in Soviet Russia, or "modernists," having "betrayed Orthodoxy," i. e., in any participation in theological or business conversations with representatives of non-Orthodox confessions (in the Ecumenical Movement, in the National Council of Church, etc.).

One may only think that with the passage of time and with the deepening of theological consciousness, this schism, as other schisms and misunderstandings in American Orthodoxy, will disappear in a natural way.

14.

A deepening of theological consciousness is what the Orthodox Church needs very badly at present. Adverse historical conditions have resulted in a generally poor educational level of Orthodox clergy and laity. As Professor Alivisatos wrote, "while other churches were producing theologians, theological schools and evangelistic movements, the Orthodox Church was busy producing martyrs for the faith." Many rifts and misunderstandings in Or-

thodox Church life today are based on the lack of elementary theological education and feeling.

The educational situation in the Orthodox Church in America has been very unfavorable. An overwhelming majority of American Orthodox clergymen have a very moderate education. Many have no theological education whatsoever and an extremely poor non-theological schooling. Unfortunately, the Holy Synod did not pay serious attention to the educational problems in its American Diocese.

The first theological seminary to train priests in North America was opened at Minneapolis, in 1905, and in 1912 transferred to Tenafly, N. J. This seminary could not boast of a high scholastic level. It was closed for lack of funds in 1923.

In 1938, St. Vladimir's Seminary was established in New York. The Seminary admitted High School graduates on condition that they simultaneously enroll for their college degree at some approved institution in New York City, usually at Columbia University.

In 1948, the program and curriculum of St. Vladimir's Seminary, established in New York in 1938, was revised and extended in order to raise the educational standard to the graduate level. The Bishops' Council of the Metropolia, on June 3, 1948, approved the reorganization of the Seminary and granted it the status of a Graduate School of Theology (or a "Theological Academy" according to Russian terminology). The institution was incorporated under the laws of the state of New York. The reorganization was possible due to the consent of several distinguished Russian scholars from Europe to join the faculty of the Seminary. They were: Very Rev. George Florovsky, George P. Fedotov (dec.), Nicholas O. Lossky, Nicholas S. Arseniev, Eugene V. Sectorsky (dec.), and Alexander Bogolepov. Later they were joined by younger scholars, graduates of St. Sergius Theological Institute in Paris, Serge Verkhovskoy, Rev. Alexander Schmemmann and Rev. John Meyendorff.

A permanent (absolute) charter was granted by the Board of Regents for and on behalf of the Educational Department of the State of New York on April 24, 1953.

"The first aim of St. Vladimir's Seminary is to provide a higher education in Orthodoxy and its theology to candi-

dates for the ministry of the Orthodox Catholic Church in the United States. At the same time it strives to be a center of research and culture, and to form a living link with the theological thought and research of the Orthodox Catholic Churches throughout the world and with the Christian Churches of the West.”⁽⁷²⁾

The Metropolia also has a pastoral training school at St. Tikhon's Monastery, South Canaan, Pa., the St. Tikhon's Theological Seminary. This school has also been in existence since 1938.

The Synodical jurisdiction has a seminary in the Holy Trinity Monastery of Jordanville, N. Y.

The Greek Archdiocese of North and South America has a college with emphasis on religion: “The Greek Institute” at Brookline, Mass. The purpose of this school is to train clergy for the Greek church only.

American Orthodox churches have actively participated in the Ecumenical Movement.

American Orthodoxy will play a more and more vital role in future Ecumenical discussions. Its unique situation among all Christian traditions and its use of one of the most important Ecumenical languages gives it great advantages in the field of Ecumenical relations. However, the whole scope of Orthodox participation in the Ecumenical Movement has to be re-examined and re-defined.

Up to now Ecumenical gatherings have helped to promote unity among the various Orthodox churches. Paradoxically, these predominately Protestant meetings have provided the historically separated and mutually indifferent Orthodox churches with a common meeting ground and have forced them to cooperate.

15.

We have touched here the most important and most painful Orthodox problems of our time. The Orthodox Catholic Church, *Una Sancta*, the mystical Body of Christ, by the Divine Commission

and by its very nature one and indivisible, in fact is utterly and completely disunited here on earth. This is the greatest sin of Orthodox people and the main reason for the obvious weakness of Orthodox witness in the modern world.

In spite of some hopeful trends, the prevailing situation in America is very distressing. There are 13 separate Orthodox national churches on this continent listed in the Yearbook of American Churches, edition for 1961, edited by B. Y. Landis and published by the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA. The book gives the following figures:

Albanian Orthodox Church in America:

Churches: 15. Inclusive membership: 14,000

American Carpatho-Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church:

Churches: 61 (1955). Inclusive membership: 100,000 (1955)

Bulgarian Eastern Orthodox Church:

Churches: 21. Inclusive membership: 80,000

Greek Archdiocese of North and South America:

Churches: 380. Inclusive membership: 1,200,000

Holy Ukrainian Autocephalic Orthodox Church in Exile:

Churches: 16. Inclusive membership: 5,000

Romanian Orthodox Episcopate of America:

Churches: 52. Inclusive membership: 50,000

Russian Orthodox Catholic Church, Archdiocese of the Aleutian Islands and North America:

No statistics available (probably, about 20 churches, D. G.)

Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia:

Churches: 81 (1955). Inclusive membership: 55,000 (1951)

Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of America (the Metropolia):

Churches: 359. Inclusive membership: 760,000 (1958)

Serbian Eastern Orthodox Church:

Churches: 73 (1955). Inclusive membership: 250,000

Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Church:

Churches: 81. Inclusive membership: 115,000

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of America:
(Ecumenical Patriarchate)

Churches: 37 (1954). Inclusive membership: 40,250

Ukrainian Orthodox Church of U. S. A.:

Churches: 92. Inclusive membership: 84,500

(All these figures are at best a very generous approximate estimate.)

Every one of these ecclesiastical jurisdictions, with a few insignificant exceptions, is distinctively national in its character, inner life, tradition and liturgical language. A genuine national tradition is often deteriorated into an inferior national minority ghettotype pattern. For example, the Russian-Pennsylvanian type of church tradition.

Each national church serves the needs of its members of a given national descent only. No missionary activities are evident, (there are a few insignificant exceptions). Actually the churches are losing their own native members to other denominations and agnosticism. The educational and intellectual level of the clergy of all jurisdictions is extremely low. There is practically no cooperation between the Orthodox national churches in America. Furthermore, the relations between different church bodies are often aggravated by mutual distrust, suspicions, and even an open struggle.

If Orthodox leaders honestly hope for the continuation and spread of the Orthodox faith in this country, not limited to East European immigrant minorities, they have to undertake certain preliminary steps for the creation of an American Orthodox Church in the future, which, incidentally, does not exclude the possibility for some national parishes, or dioceses for the immigrants, to maintain cultural ties with their native lands (as in the case of Italian or Lithuanian parishes in the Roman Catholic Church in America.)

Thanks to God, the greatest step in this direction has already been made. On the initiative of His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos, the Exarch of the Ecumenical Patriarch in America, since March, 1960 the Standing Conference of U. S. Orthodox hierarchs of various national churches has been organized and meets regularly to bring them closer together.

Not only the leaders of the Orthodox churches, but all conscientious Orthodox people, have to become active members of this movement for the unity of the Church. Church youth organizations like FROC, SOYA, GOYA, etc., must become keenly interested in the problem.

Ours is a difficult and painful task; too many national, psychological and personal motives are involved. Historical precedents, canonical and juridical arguments will lead nowhere. Humility, yielding and above all love are the only effective means for the creation of ecclesiastical unity.

No matter how difficult seems the achievement of our goal — the unity of all Orthodox faithful in America in one glorious Church — we are bound to strive for it. We have no right to abandon the search for unity. If our minds, our wills, and our hearts are weak, we should not forget the all-powerful help of God. He loves us and wants us to be together, "...that they may be one, as we are one." (John 17:11). Let us, therefore, "love one another that with one accord we may confess: Father, Son, and Holy spirit."

NOTES

1. *Ocherk iz istorii amerikanskoy pravoslavnoy duchovnoy missii* (Kadyakskoy missii 1794-1837). St. Petersburg, 1894, pp. 4-9. Following information of the Kodiak Mission and Elder German has been taken from the same source.
2. *Puteshestviya i issledovaniya Leitenanta Lavrentiya Zagoskina v russkoy Amerike v 1842-1844*. Moscow, 1956. p. 422.
3. S. Bolshakoff, *The Foreign Missions of the Russian Orthodox Church*. London: MacMillan, 1943. p. 87. See also I. Barsukov, *Innokentiy*, St. Petersburg, Synod Press, 1883.
4. B. M. Bensin, *History of the Russian Greek Catholic Church of North America*, New York, 1941. p. 10.
5. B. Zoustis, *I Istoria tes Ellinikis Archiepiskopis Amerikis*, New York, 1954, p. 45.

6. A. Lopuchin, **Zhizn za okeanom**, St. Petersburg, 1882. pp. 179-206.
7. Bishop Leonty, "A History of the Russian Orthodox Church in America," **The Russian Orthodox Journal**. Vol. 19, No.4 (1945).
8. **Ibid.**, Vol. 19, No. 6 (1945).
9. P. Kochanik, **Yubileyniy sbornik soyuza pravoslavnych sviashchennikov v Amerike**, New York, 1936. pp. 84-103
10. Zoustis, **op. cit.**, p. 93.
11. S. H. R. Upson, **Orthodox Church History**, Brooklyn 1953, p. 92.
12. J. Chepeleff, "American Sobors," **Russian Orthodox Calendar America**, New York, 1955, p. 155.
13. **Eighth All-American Sobor Official Minutes**, 1950. 4th page after the last numbered page.
14. B. M. Bensin, "Vospominaniya. Uchebniya programmy nashey seminarii," **The Russian American Orthodox Messenger**, New York, No. 11 (1945).
15. **Sixth All-American Sobor, Official Minutes**, 1937, p. 19.
16. A. Schmemmann, "The Canonical Position of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America," **Year Book of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America**, New York, 1953. See also: **Postanovleniya osviashchennago sobora** (Official minutes), New York, 1924, p. 32.
17. Schmemmann, **op. cit.**
18. Library of Congress, Archives of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America.
19. **Ibid.**
20. Rev. Timothy Peshkov, Rev. Nestor Nikolenko, Rev. Nicholas Shustakevich.
21. Prof. Strakhovsky, **Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Church of Christ the Saviour in Toronto, Canada**, Toronto, 1955.
22. **Russian Orthodox Calendar-Almanac**, 1955, p. 156.
23. **Ibid.**, p. 158.
24. "When Metropolitan Platon, an hierarch with a domineering character, who from 1907 to 1914 was already a ruling bishop of the American Diocese, returned to the United States and by the Ukaz of the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon of September 29, 1923, was appointed again to the American See, Kedrovsky (a pseudo-bishop appointed by the Living Church. D. G.) began to dispute his right to head the Russian Church in America." **Zhurnal Moskovskoy Patriarchii**, Moscow, 1957, No.6 (June) p. 67.
25. New York Supreme Court Records, p. 67.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
27. Postanovleniya osviaschennago sobora (official minutes), New York, 1924, p. 32.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
29. *Ibid.*
30. V. Rev. A. Schmemmann, "The Canonical Position of the Russian Orthodox Church of North America," 1952 Year Book of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America. New York, 1953.
31. Official Minutes. Sixth Sobor of 1937, New York, 1937, p. 14. See also J. S. Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*, 1917-1950. Boston, 1953, p. 94.
32. Zoustis, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 147-151. See also: Constantin Callinicos, *The History of the Orthodox Church*, Los Angeles, 2nd edition, 1957, pp. 114-117.
34. Zoustis, *op. cit.*, p. 147.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 216.
36. Upson, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.
37. M. Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia*, New York 1956, p. 25.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 26. See also *Put moyey zhizni* (Memoirs of Metropolitan Eulogius, Paris, YMCA Press, 1947, p. 402.
39. *Russkaya pravoslavnaya tzerkov v Severnoy Amerike, istoricheskaya spravka*, Jordanville, New York, 1955, p. 20.
40. Bishop Apolinarius (Koshevoy), grad. of Kiev Graduate School of Theology, consecrated 1917, came to America 1924, died 1933.
41. *Nasha tzerkov v Amerike i trebovaniya patriarshevo prestola*, a pamphlet by Fathers P. Kohanik and A. Kukulevsky, New York, 1945, p. 12.
42. The Epistle of Metropolitan Sergiy of July 9, 1933, issued in New York on July, 28, under No. 49 with notes by Archbishop Benjamin.
43. *Put moyey zhizni*, Memoirs of Metropolitan Eulogius, Paris, 1947, pp. 618-627.
44. The Epistle of Metropolitan Sergiy, note 2 to p. 2 by Archbishop Benjamin.
45. The Ukaze was issued in New York by Archbishop Benjamin on Sept. 9, under No. 88.
46. New York Supreme Court, p. 78.
47. *Ibid.*

48. Official minutes.
49. New York Supreme Court, p. 34. See also Ukaze of Patriarch Alexis to Metropolitan Theophilos, Dec. 26, 1947, Documents p. 19.
50. See already cited books of Upson and Callinikos for information on various national dioceses given here.
51. Official minutes of Sixth All-American Sobor, pp. 21-24.
52. Uubileynyi sboruik, New York, 1944, v. 1, p. 287.
53. Bolshakoff, op. cit., p. 91.
54. Russian American Orthodox Messenger, 1941, No. 10.
55. Russian daily Rossia, New York, Judy, 13. 1941.
56. Zhurnal, Moskovskoy Patriarchiyi, 1943, No. 2. See also: The Church in Soviet Russia, by Matthew Spinka, New York, 1956, p. 89.
57. Russkaya pravoslavnyaya tserkov v Severnoy Amerike, Jordanville, New York, 1955, p. 9-94.
58. Russian American Orthodox Messenger, 1943, No. 10.
59. Christian Register, Oct. 1943, p. 348.
60. Russian American Orthodox Messenger, 1943, No. 11.
61. Ibid., 1944, No. 6.
62. Nasha tserkov v Amerike i trebovaniya patriarshego prestola, by Fathers P. Kohanik and A. Kukulevsky, 1945, p. 3.
63. The Russian Orthodox Journal, June, 1945, p. 9.
64. Josepf Dzuonchik, V. Rev., "My Journey to Moscow," The Russian Orthodox Journal, June 1945.
65. Official minutes of the Seventh All-American Church Sobor.
66. Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America. Documents bearing on relations with the Patriarchy of Moscow. New York, 1947.
67. The Russian American Orthodox Messenger, New York, November, 1947, No. 11; also Documents.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid.
70. Eighth All-American Church Sobor. Official Minutes. New York, 1950, p. 68.
71. Ibid.
72. Year Book and Church Directory of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, New York, 1957. p. 133.



One Bishop in One City

(Canon 8, First Ecumenical Council)

John Meyendorff

No canonical regulation has ever been affirmed by the Tradition of the Church with more firmness than the rule which forbids the existence of separate ecclesiastical structures in a single place. The strictly territorial character of Church organization seemed practically self-evident to the Fathers of all the Councils and it is implied by all the canons dealing with ecclesiastical order. We will try to give here a brief analysis of this canonical legislation of the Church and a definition of its theological and spiritual meaning.

1. The canons.

The Orthodox Church has not, as yet, provided her faithful with a complete system of canonical legislation. It is even doubtful whether she will ever do so. The fulness of divine truth and life indeed abides in the Church, and no juridical system will ever be completely adequate to this living and organic reality, which true Christians know only by experience. What is then the real meaning of our canons? As soon as we are acquainted with their text, we discover that they usually have been issued in relation to specific situations and distortions of ecclesiastical life, which occurred in the past. In order to understand them fully it is necessary to be acquainted with the particular historical circumstances in which they were published. Then, the eternal and normative value of the canons becomes manifest. They appear as a kind of medicine applied by Councils and Church Fathers to cure specific diseases of the ecclesiastical organism. This cure was a product of the eternal and permanent nature of the Church. It was, and still is, a witness of the unchangeable identity of the Church, its inner organization and structure being established upon the Apostolic witness and provided with the constant presence of the Holy Spirit. The canons indicate to us how to apply to the changeable realities of human

history this unchangeable and vivifying reality of the redemptive grace of God abiding in the Church. To consciously disregard the canons of the Church leads finally to corruption of Church life, i. e., to ecclesiological heresy.

In order to understand correctly each canon of the Church, we must therefore first localize it in its proper historical setting, and then define the particular aspect of the eternal nature of the Church to which it corresponds. Regarding the question which now occupies us — the territorial structure of the Church in the Orthodox tradition — no serious question of interpretation arises and both the formulas and their meaning are absolutely clear.

Several Ecumenical Councils have issued decisions on the matter and the historical situation in which these decisions were made was not really different from ours. These decisions of the highest authority of the Church are obviously expressions of Holy Tradition and we can safely affirm that by their very consistency they express the true and permanent nature of the Church.

The First Ecumenical Council, called in 325 in Nicaea by Emperor Constantine, mainly dealt with the doctrinal question of the Arian heresy, but it also had to pay attention to the remnants of various struggles which had divided Christians in the time of the persecutions. Among these dissensions was the schism of the "Novatians," a sect of puritans, refusing forgiveness to Christians who betrayed the faith during the persecutions and formally condemning second marriages. After peace was given to the Church by Constantine, many Novatians wished to return to the communion of the Church. Canon 8 of Nicaea defines the mode through which Novatian communities were to be reunited. Since no question arose as to the validity of Novatian ordinations, the episcopal dignity was to be granted to their bishops, but only in places where no parallel orthodox hierarchy already existed. "But wherever there is a Bishop of the catholic church," proclaims the council, "it is obvious that, as the Bishops of the Church will keep the dignity of bishop, the one called a bishop among the so-called puritans shall have the honor of a Presbyter... There may not be two bishops in the city."¹ It would obviously have been easier to solve the Nova-

¹. The major canonical texts of the Orthodox Church are easily available in English. The canons of the Ecumenical Councils are published by H. R.

tian problem by giving the schismatic bishops some honorary title, or else by transferring them to some empty episcopal see, or by keeping them as heads of their churches, thus establishing two parallel, mutually recognized "jurisdictions" in the same place, but the Council decided otherwise and solemnly proclaimed the principle of territorial unity of the Church.

In a somewhat different historical context, the Second Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 381) formulated the same principle on the level of provincial ecclesiastical administration. The Church of Alexandria having, at that time, shown the tendency to intervene and perform ordinations in provinces which did not belong to its jurisdiction, especially in Constantinople, the council ordered in canon 2 that, "The Bishops are not to go beyond their own dioceses to churches lying outside of their bounds, nor bring confusion on the churches... And let not bishops go beyond their dioceses for ordinations or any other ecclesiastical ministrations, unless they be invited. And the aforesaid canon concerning dioceses being observed, it is evident that the synod of every province will administer the affairs of that particular province as was decreed in Nicaea." The Third Ecumenical Council also declared, in relation to the Church of Cyprus: "None of the God-beloved bishops shall assume control of any province which has not heretofore, from the very beginning, been under his own hand or that of his predecessors" (canon 8). Finally, we find the same principle in canon 20 of the Quinisext (Sixth Ecumenical) Council: "It shall not be lawful for a bishop to teach publicly in any city which does not belong to him. If any shall be observed doing this, let him cease from his episcopate."

A single bishop in every local community, a single synod or council in every province, such is the absolute rule established by the Fathers. In the course of centuries, the Church had to protect

Percival, *The Seven Ecumenical Councils of the undivided church, their canons and dogmatic decrees*, in *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, second series, vol. XIV, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1956. Cf. also a translation of the standard canonical collection of the Greek-speaking churches, the "Pedalion" or "Rudder" compiled in the late 18th century by St. Nicodemos of the Holy Mountain, which has been published recently in the United States by the Orthodox Christian Educational Society (Chicago, Ill., 1957).

this rule against many attempts to alter it by the establishment of different principles of ecclesiastical administration. The importance and the authority of some churches led them to exercise a power over an area larger than their own ecclesiastical district, and to "bring confusion on the churches." We already saw the Second Ecumenical Council dealing with Alexandrian pretensions of this kind. The bishops of northern Africa, gathered in Carthage in 419, who were traditionally opposed to the interventions of Rome in their provincial affairs, wrote to pope Celestine that "all matters should be terminated in the places where they arise" and that the Fathers "did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting to any province." No bishop, patriarch or pope can put himself above the council of bishops of a given province "unless it be imagined that God can inspire a single individual with justice, and refuse it to an innumerable multitude of bishops assembled in council."¹ The ecclesiastical affairs of a province cannot be solved from far off, "from behind the see," as the African bishops put it, since the only true aim of Christians is to promote and establish the Kingdom of God in every place, and not to serve the interests or ambitions of any particular church or individual.

The same territorial principle was applied in 692 by the Council "in Trullo" (Sixth Ecumenical) to a case very similar to our contemporary situations: the Cypriot immigration in Asia Minor. Wars between the Arabs and Byzantines provoked shifts of population in the border regions and one of these shifts concerned, in 691, the larger part of the population of Cyprus, which was transferred by Emperor Justinian II to the district of the Hellespont, near the sea of Marmara.

Ecclesiastically, the district possessed in Cyzicus its own metropolitan whose elections were confirmed by the Patriarch of Constantinople. Strictly speaking, the Cypriot bishops, who followed their flock in exile, should have submitted to this local jurisdiction. However the archbishop of Cyprus, since the time of the Council of Ephesus (431), was the head of an autocephalous church. The general council of 692 decided to preserve his former right in his new jurisdictional area. The only way of doing it, without encroaching on the territorial unity of the Church, was to submit the metro-

¹ Percival, *ed. cit.*, p. 510.

politan of Cyzicus to the former Cypriot archbishop and also to delegate to him the primatial rights of Constantinople over the area of Hellespont. Both actions were taken by the council (canon 39): "We decree... that new Justinianopolis¹ shall have the rights of Constantinople and whoever is constituted the pious and most religious bishop thereof shall take precedence of all the bishops of the province of the Hellespont and be elected by his own bishops according to ancient custom.... the existing bishop of the city of Cyzicus being subject to the metropolitan of the aforesaid Justinianopolis..."²

It is therefore quite obvious that the autocephalous status of the Church of Cyprus did not give her any right to establish her own ecclesiastical administration in places which already possessed a local ecclesiastical structure. The council did not admit the creation of a parallel Cypriot jurisdiction in Hellespont and preserved territorial unity. It solved quite radically a question of precedence, at the expense of the existing authorities — Constantinople and Cyzicus — but did not divide the Church. The pattern of ecclesiastical structure remained the same: one church, one bishop, one community in every single place. The canons of the Church have always protected this simple principle against all attempts to create several separated ecclesiastical administrations in the same place or country, and also against the tendency of some big and important churches (Rome, Alexandria, Antioch) to deprive the local bishops of their authority and to affirm their own power over the rights of the local synods.

II. The nature of the Church.

The aim of the Incarnation of the Son of God and the very purpose of His teaching, death and resurrection was to establish between God and men a new relation, a new unity: "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one. I in them and thou in me, that they may be made per-

-
1. Justinianopolis was then the name of Constantia, capital of Cyprus. The Cypriot settlement in Hellespont was called "new Justinianopolis."
 2. Percival, *ed. cit.*, p. 383; see also the commentary on this canon by Bishop Nikodim Milash, *Pravila Praveslavnoi Tserkvi s tolkovaniami*, vol. 1. St. Petersburg, 1911, pp. 524-525, and by Nicodemos of the Holy Mountain in *the Rudder*, *ed. cit.*, p. 335. The Cypriots later returned to their home island, but their Archbishop still keeps among his honorific titles that of "bishop of new Justinianopolis."

fect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me" (John 17:22-33). Unity with God supposes also unity between men, a unity which is described here by Christ Himself as visible to the world and as a witness concerning His own mission. It is by seeing the unity that Christians have among themselves that the world "knows" and "believes." This unity is not therefore only a spiritual and invisible reality, but it appears in the concrete visible life of the world. Without Christ's unity, Christians cannot truly fulfill their call, because the world cannot see in them the new life given in Him.

This is the reason why at the very origin of the Church, "all that believed were together and had all things in common" (Acts 2:44). Christians gathered together regularly for the celebration of the Lord's Supper and nothing, not even the Roman persecutions, could prevent them from holding their assemblies because the very nature of their faith implied that God abided not in each of them individually, but in the entire Church, the Body of Christ. Only by being a member of this Body could the individual also be a member of Christ. Early Christians considered each church assembly, held in the name of Christ, i. e., in unity and love, as witness of Christ's victory over human egoism, selfishness and sin. A Father of the first century, St. Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, wrote in a letter to the church of Ephesus: "Be zealous to assemble more frequently to render thanks (in Greek, *eucharistein*, i. e., "celebrate the Eucharist") and praise to God. For, when you meet together frequently, the powers of Satan are destroyed and danger from him is dissolved in the harmony of your faith."¹

No other passage of early Christian literature gives a clearer indication of the very mystery of the Christian Church: by the power of the Holy Spirit, scattered and separated human beings are able to become, when they gather, a powerful and victorious transfigured reality: "Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). This real presence of God in the assembly of the Church makes it possible that the various Christian ministries are really Christ's mysteries and this concerns first of all the episcopal function. Every Christian com-

Ephesians 6:13, transl. by G. G. Walsh, *The Fathers of the Church, The Apostolic Fathers*, New York, 1947, p. 92.

munity is manifesting the Body of Christ in its fulness since this Body cannot be divided: "Wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church."¹ The function of the bishop is to fulfill in the assembly the ministry of the Head, to sit where Christ sat among His disciples, to teach what He taught, to be the shepherd and the High-Priest. "Let all follow the bishop," St. Ignatius writes, "as Jesus Christ did the Father, and the priests, as you would the Apostles... Let that Eucharist be held valid which is offered by the bishop or by one to whom the bishop has committed this charge. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be."² There is no Church without the bishop, but, the reverse being also true, there is no bishop outside of the Church, since the head needs a body to fulfill its function. In the views of St. Ignatius, which are confirmed by the entire tradition of the Church, it is in the Eucharist that the divinely instituted episcopal ministry finds its real meaning. However, the Eucharist is the sacrament of our unity with God and of our unity in Christ among ourselves. The bishop stands at the very center of this mystery. His sacramental functions in the Eucharistic liturgy are complemented by his pastoral responsibilities which oblige him to assure in the practical life of the Church the unity given sacramentally by God in the Eucharist. His ministry is therefore one of reconciliation and unity.

All these aspects of orthodox ecclesiology constitute the foundation of our canonical legislation concerning Church structure.

It is inadmissible to have two communities and two bishops in a single place, simply because Christ is one, and only one person can fill His place. This point is of a particular importance today, in our dialogues with Roman Catholics who have begun to realize that the existence of one "vicar of Christ" for all the churches duplicates (if it does not suppress) the episcopal sacramental ministry of each

1. St. Ignatius of Antioch. *Letter to the Smyrneans*, 8, *ibid.*, p. 121. This is the earliest example of the adjective "catholic" applied to the Church in Christian literature.

2. *Smyr*, *ibid.* In the time of St. Ignatius, every Christian community (or "parish") was headed by a bishop who normally was the only celebrant of the Eucharist. Later, with the expansion of Christianity, the bishops started to delegate their privileges to priests on a permanent basis. The parish priest is nowadays the normal center of Church life on the parish level, but he cannot fulfil these functions unless he is appointed by the bishop.

particular local community.¹ In the Roman Church, there can be neither theological nor practical objection to maintaining in a single place several ecclesiastical jurisdictions, separated by rite, language or nationality, because the **criterion of their unity** and the center of their ecclesiastical life is always to be found in Rome, outside their own limits. On the contrary, Orthodox ecclesiology, in affirming the catholic fulness of every local church, is bound to manifest catholic unity everywhere on the local level. The presence of Christ in the Church is guaranteed by the very **gathering in His name**, in the unity of the true faith and in conformity with true tradition, and not by an allegiance to some universal center.

What happens then when Orthodox Christians living side by side in the same city consider it normal to constitute several "churches" — the Russian, Greek, Serbian or Syrian — which, of course, maintain their formal unity in faith and spirit, but not in practice? There is no doubt that such a situation is the greatest blow to our witness in the contemporary world and goes against the very nature of the Church of Christ. Any reference to "spiritual unity" or "sacramental intercommunion" is of no relevance in this connection because Christ has established on earth a Church **visibly** one and because the meaning of spiritual communion consists precisely in giving us the strength and responsibility to accomplish **visible unity**.

Conclusion:

The tradition of the Church being clear on this point both on the canonical and on the doctrinal level, the only question which may arise is whether strict territorial unity — one Orthodox bishop one Orthodox Church in every place for all nationalities and groups — is practical and practicable in 1961 in America. I would answer this question in a twofold manner.

First, by historical evidence: until the early twenties of the present century, when the united Orthodox Church of America (in the Russian jurisdiction) began to disintegrate into an entire constellation of parallel national jurisdictions, it is impossible to find in the entire history of the Church any example of the territorial

¹. This point was dealt with by several authors in one of the last issues of the *Quarterly* devoted to **Primacy and primacies in the Orthodox Church** (1960, nos. 2-3).

principle being overlooked. Do we have the right then to consider our present situation as normal?

Second: Orthodox canon law admits what is called the principle of "economy." The most competent canonists of our time are unanimous in defining this principle as a conscious relaxation by the ecclesiastical authorities of the letter of the canons in cases when a strict legalistic observance would do more harm than good to the entire body of the Church¹. Let us therefore act slowly and carefully "for the good of the Church." For a relatively long period of time, we must give the greatest attention to the existence in America of various national groups preserving their national identity. This can easily be secured inside a united Church. National organizations and societies will have to be maintained for the next few generations, and it is equally unavoidable that parishes, deaneries and even dioceses will preserve for some time their national character, but a single Church structure must unite and coordinate Church life in America. Various concrete needs can be covered by the principle of "ecclesiastical economy," but division cannot remain a permanent norm, and, at the same time, it is to be remembered that the "good of the Church" which may justify temporal separation requires also unity. The final and ultimate challenge to all of us begins when this "good of the Church" **conflicts** with the interests of our respective national groups. There is no doubt that, in this case, any Orthodox Christian, whether bishop, priest or layman, is bound to put the will of God and the Holy Tradition of the Church above the "human traditions," which were condemned by the Lord as soon as they conflicted with the law of grace. With wisdom and care, let us move towards the restoration of Orthodox canonical norms in America.

John Meyendorff.

1. N. S. Alivisatos, **Economy from the Orthodox point of view** (in Greek), Athens, 1949, pp. 31-39; Jerome Kotsonis, **Problems of "ecclesiastical economy"** (in Greek), Athens, 1957, pp. 30-50, etc.

The Orthodox Church in the United States as viewed from the Social Sciences

Rev. Constantine Volaitis

America, today, stands in the vanguard of nations affected, within the short span of two generations, by two movements, altering her to the very foundation, and permeating every aspect of her life. The implications of the emergence of the industrial age after 1914 and the dawn of the atomic age in 1945, affect every institution and necessitate a re-appraisal and re-evaluation of every phase of our lives. Every religious institution is influenced by this turn of events, and everywhere the concern is to enable religious faith to remain relevant for mankind and to make it functional in the new changed world of the twentieth century.

Affected profoundly are the Orthodox churches and ethnic groups which responded to the challenge of the dawning industrial age and have found themselves since the turn of the century, part of the American way of life. Two generations have passed, patterns of living have been established, adaption and acculturation have taken place. Required is a critical evaluation of these factors and forces in order to evolve a considered prognosis of what lies ahead. To retain what is sound and to alter what is not, must be the keystone of an effort to make Orthodoxy a living dynamic force in the life of its people. Study and research in the social history and patterns of the Orthodox immigrant, as he came from the old world into the new, are imperative towards this end. The description of his life as it came into contact with the new forces at work within his new homeland, the change that took place in his personality as he gradually become an American, the changes in his group life as the result of acculturation and assimilation, the new direction of his family life and the effect of the new culture upon his children and his children's children have not yet begun to be told. Also, the description of the Orthodox churches in the United States

an the bearers of the old culture, the link with the land of origin, the maintainer of the traditions, mores and norms of the people who constituted it, and, above all, overarching, the various national jurisdictions, with their ethnic and even political subcultures, the Church, as the Holy Nation of God, the people of God's own possession, the mystical Body of the Risen Lord which contains within itself the unique calling of all its members and, indeed, of all mankind, to salvation, within the Kingdom of God, all these have not been described as they function within society.

The Church must be viewed from two levels, from its theological implication, on the one hand, as the Divine Society, the Body of Christ, and, on the other, as an association of men within history, in specific localities, affected by and affecting economic, cultural, political and social elements constantly, being on the one hand eternal and changeless and on the other, constantly being changed and altered.

In short, the Church must also be looked at as one of the prevailing social systems, in which people interact, where there are certain group ends and goals to be attained where the system is can break down and become dysfunctional; its members can leave it and become parts of other social systems. Within this system is also a prevailing power structure whereby administration and decision-making takes place. In times of stress, certain changes and modifications take place within this system and new forces and variables can be discerned at work.

From this view point the social sciences have a positive contribution to make to the Orthodox Church. We must say of the Orthodox Church what Father Joseph Fichter says of the Roman Catholic Church in America, "The Church in America.... is ready for a thorough analysis of the present objective facts of its existence. Its values are eternal, and its doctrines are incorrupt; but they are concretized by human agents in a social system..... The planning of new directions, of new forms, of grester vitality must be projected from a thorough knowledge of the present."¹

We would concur also in Father Fichter's statement that "Urban America is unique in the history of the world, it raises special problems which the church never encountered in the past and has no experience with which to cope with them." "Just as in

imes past," Father Fichter continues, "the Church turned to philosophers and physical scientists for help in philosophical and physical problems, so now she must turn to the social scientists for help in social problems."

It is from this view point that this article is written, to raise some questions that require answers about aspects of our life as members of the Church of Christ and members also of immigrant, ethnic subgroups in the process of change, here in the United States, that require not theological answers, but, if we are to survive, answers and solutions which can proceed out of the Social Sciences.

"Cardinal Suhard, recognizing "the crisis of growth and change" in modern society, praised the extensive research of scholars, sociologists, and technicians and advised them to "draw up an objective evaluation of our urban civilization of today, with its gigantic concentrations and its continued growth; with the strains of its inhuman production, its unjust distribution and its exhausting forms of entertainment".²

In this regard, one of the most promising and hope-filled endeavors towards this end of working towards a masterplan of Orthodox cooperation and joint action, is the Standing Conference of Orthodox Bishops under the chairmanship of Archbishop Iakovos of the Greek Orthodox Church, and Metropolitan Anthony of the Syrian Church, which has authorized commissions to work towards effective solutions of common problems.

Herbert Blumer has some penetrating insights which could serve as a summary of the relation of Social Science to the Church. He puts forth that a theory of the church must, by necessity, involve an adequate social theory able to cope with the problem of social control as it is set by changing social life. "If the Church wishes to lay the basis of a technique it must attempt to understand and to control the process of becoming...

"By comparing situations of a certain type the social technician must find out what are the predominant values or the predominant attitudes which determine the situation more than others, and then the question is to modify these values or these attitudes in the desired way by using the knowledge of social causation gained by social theory."³

Blumer points out here that the function of research is to understand a given situation and also to develop the techniques, to alter and modify directions to a desired end.

A fascinating example of the ability of the social sciences to radically alter and change the directions of a whole nation was the case of post-war Germany by a group of social scientists headed by Talcott Parsons.⁴

The Orthodox Churches in the New World

The history of the Orthodox peoples in the United States begins with the permanent colony of Russian settlers and soldiers on Kodyak Island in 1785, which saw the establishment of the first Orthodox church in the United States in 1795. This was followed by other churches and missions which, by 1840, counted seven churches and thirty-five chapels throughout Alaska, and the whole Aleutian Islands. After the transfer of Alaska to the United States in 1867, these had grown to twelve parishes with some eighteen churches and forty-five chapels. However, the mass emigrations from Russia date from the time of Alexander III (1881-1894). It is after 1880 then, that we can say that mass emigrations from Orthodox countries begin.

The first two decades of the twentieth century are the peak years of immigrations for the Orthodox to America. It is extremely difficult to get accurate statistics in this area as records were not properly kept; in addition, new countries have emerged after World War I, for example, Albania and Yugoslavia, for which population figures are not available until after 1920. The Russian and Rumanian figures are largely Jewish rather than Greek Orthodox. There are but few studies devoted to the behavior patterns, social values and norms in the life of these early immigrants to reflect changes in behavior and attitudes. Research is required in the demography of the Orthodox immigrant, for this early period contains many keys for the understanding of our contemporary situation.

In those early years, life in America was drastically changing, the United States was entering full blast into the industrial age, and, even though the Land Grant Acts had not fully expired, the

great dynamic of America had shifted from an agrarian economy to an industrial. Industrial America had emerged, and the Orthodox immigrant here saw and responded to the new opportunities and challenge which were opening before him. Thus it was that, in ever-increasing number, the immigrants streamed into the factories, the steel mills and mines, and the laying of railroad tracks across the nation. As a result, almost 98 % of the Orthodox population is urban and concentrated in the large metropolitan areas. The Russian groups are an exception to this, showing a slightly lower urban percentage of 84 %, with 16 % rural. This factor is one that would considerably accelerate the break-up of the traditional patterns characteristic of the agrarian way of life of the Orthodox peasant in Europe. The character of this new urban industrial life that begins in America after 1914, had sweeping impact on the whole structure of American life, everything has changed and is still changing as a result of this. Add to this the implications of the atomic age which begins after 1945 and one can readily appreciate the dimensions of the problem which the churches of a largely agrarian society, utilizing a symbol system proceeding out of the Byzantine empire, are now encountering. They are not alone in this problem, for it affects every religious and social institution in the country and throughout the world.

The newcomers did not have an easy time in the new world. Jobs were not plentiful, wages were low and exploitation was rampant. The Slavs, as a rule, settled in the coal mining and steel areas, the Greeks started out in the factories of New England and later spread out to work on the railroad gangs of the west, while the Syrians, following the Jews, became peddlers and later, merchandisers. We can see the subsequent development of these immigrants as they worked and formed their communities and slowly ascended the economic and social ladders of American life. What is missing, however, is the documentation of the changes that took place in their personalities because of the hard, long, fatiguing hours in the mines, steel mills and tiny restaurants, the changes that took place within their value systems in the struggle for survival and upward mobility. Bernard C. Rosen, in a study of six groups, found that the Jews and the Greeks have obtained middle-class status more rapidly than any of the other four groups. The important factor, he points out, is the individual's psychological and cultural orientation towards achievement.⁵ What does not

appear is the oftentime high cost of such motivation and achievement perhaps at the expense of spiritual values.

There are no studies available on the differences between the Greek who stayed in the New England factory and the one who became a restaurant owner in a southern town, or the difference between the Russian in the milltown in Pennsylvania and the emigrants who arrived as political exiles after the Bolshevik Revolution. Accurate population studies of the various ethnic groups and religious communities are of primary importance in attempting a prognosis of the life and vitality of the Orthodox church within the United States. It was extremely difficult as was pointed out to arrive at accurate estimates of the Orthodox population in the United States because, again, of the paucity of material in this area, but this must be attempted for, only through such studies can we observe some measurable trends, in such areas as group growth, group leakage, death rates, birth rates, marriages, and especially, intermarriages, ratios between foreign-born and native-born. Where statistics convey danger to the continued health and maintainance of the group, we must be able to read the signs well in advance and to take the steps which can correct the situation.

Family Life

Family life in the United States poses a very serious problem in the life of the Orthodox churches. It has introduced a brand new concept of norms and standards which, overall, vary from those prevailing in Europe.⁶ In America, the kinship system now is based on the concept of the nuclear family, or "the conjugal family"; this basic unit consists only of a husband and wife and their immediate offspring, who are expected to leave the family nest as soon as they are financially independent.⁷ This isolated family unit is in sharp contrast to the old world Orthodox family pattern where the basic family unit included grand-parents, brothers and sisters, aunts and uncles.

In a Lebanese village, for example, the biological family was not significant; what was significant was the extended family composed of grandparents, married sons with their wives, unmarried daughters, grandchildren, and so forth. Their farms were worked

communally and the joint family comprised also the basic economic unit of the area. Families, through the larger family, obtained homes, their economic livelihood and social status within the community. Against this stands the structural isolation of the American nuclear family. This is apparent at its height within the cities, which further heightens the problem of the Church, since over 90 % of the Orthodox population in the United States is urban.

The Orthodox family pattern traditionally has been a patriarchal system, the roles of husband, wife and grandparents always delineated and conforming to the biblical image that comes out of Pauline theology and continues down ever since. The incidence of divorce has remained very low. Afif Tannous, in his study of an Arab-Syrian community in the deep south, records only nine cases of divorce in forty years.⁸

Against this stands a trend to instability and "a mother-centered type of family structure."⁹ The larger family demonstrates an ability to provide a continuity and social and economic structure where the individual knew his designated role. This provided a sense of security as contrasted with the lack of roots and instability of the family pattern in the United States. In the old world, marriages were arranged, choices being dictated by practicality and rooted in economic necessity, a person remained in the village where he was born and identified with that community. In the new world, he becomes exposed to choosing a partner without parental influences and largely without need to consider the financial aspects. The Orthodox citizen no longer remains a part of the community where he was born, but becomes a part of the constantly moving stream of American life. No longer can the extended family, with its richness of tradition and solidarity, keep him within its circle, but leaves him alone with his nuclear family, to strive as best he can to attain a new cultural, social and religious identification.

With his new freedom in selecting a mate for himself, the young Orthodox person, with increasing frequency, is entering into marriage with others not of his own traditions and background. A new problem and challenge is posed for the church, for, young people today, who are relatively free in mate selection, and who are at a distance with their own culture, reflect those values which their forefathers. The consequence here is that with increasing frequen-

are oftentimes inconsistent and opposed to the view of marriage as is reflected in the centuries-old traditions of their fathers and forefathers. The consequence here is that with increasing frequency, the selection of mates becomes the most disintegrating factor to which the Church as church and the sub-ethnic community is today exposed.

The romantic love image which comes out of Hollywood becomes substituted for the richer, realistic and secure family pattern of an earlier day. The traditional Orthodox family system provided protection and care for aunts and uncles, grandparents and even cousins. Orthodox culture in the United States still ranks very high in familialistic attitudes.

Panos D. Bardis compared four groups of high school and college students. They were a Mennonite college, an urban public high school in the Midwest, a Methodist college in Michigan, and a Greek high school in the Peloponnesus, in Greece. He found that the Greek students had a significantly higher familialism scale, while the Methodist scored the lowest.¹⁰

The Orthodox house-holder in the United States generally still reflects this same attitude and is genuinely concerned for his aged parents. However, because of the nuclear family pattern which prevails in American society, the old attitudes are breaking down very rapidly, leaving in their wake anxiety, tensions and guilt, because of the contradiction between how he acts and what has been taught by his culture. In the Greek community an alternative to the problem has been made in the last five years, with the establishment of old-age homes, which might be considered symbolic of the undercurrent anxiety of the breakdown in traditional family patterns.

Role definition between male and female in the old-world Orthodox community was precise and fixed; now, one of the real difficulties is the inability to define proper roles in American life. In the occupational system, male and female cannot be distinguished, so, in this area there is a blurring over of role lines. Also, contributing is the fact that woman is no longer exclusively dependent upon her husband, but now can hold property in her own right. There has been a subtle rise in an evolving American matriarchy which places great strain on the traditional patterns of the Orthodox family. The entire symbol system of marriage, e. g., St. Paul's

injunction to the wives in the Letter to the Ephesians, "Wives, be subject to your husbands," (Ephes. 5:22) and also, the entire content of the marriage rite, requires a new appraisal by the contemporary Church to rebridge the chasm between what is theoretically held and what functionally exists.

Talcott Parsons points out a need for a functional equivalent that will enable a woman in modern society to fulfill the needs of her nature without necessarily seeking to assume a competitive masculine role.¹¹ Contributing further to this dilemma is the modern woman's loss of identity with the traditional image of modesty and purity, the identification with the Virgin Mary and the retinue of feminine sainthood which have provided the dominant motivation of the past. Riesman asks, "What models is one to take? One's forefathers who were surrounded by modest and chaste woman? Or the contemporary Kinsey athlete who boasts of freedom and experience?"¹² The modern woman is caught right in the middle of this tragic dilemma and cannot resolve whether she should maintain her standards or seize a mate via biological experiences. Ours is a world where traditional norms of morality and behaviour are every day being the more undermined and in need of new appraisal and judgments. The question is whether the standards and norms are going to proceed out of the Church or whether the Church is simply going to adjust and hope to recoup the play at a later date.

Another by-product of the impact of these new forces and elements which are starting to alter so radically the forms of our ancestral house, is the emergence of the new so-called "Youth Culture." This is the period between childhood and maturity that reflects the tensions, strain and anxiety that are concomitant with the emergence of the isolated nuclear family pattern. A young person, reflecting the breakdown of the extended family pattern with its stabilizing value systems which hold out a secure established way of life, enriched with the legacy and traditions that are centuries old, the gradual decline of the father's authority, is left to a certain extent rootless in an anomic state. What is required is a focus on the adolescent and his cultural estrangement. Fortunately, the Orthodox family pattern seems to have held up rather well, though the post-war years have shown a marked acceleration in the breakup in this area of the traditional Orthodox family con-

cept, this problem requires the most serious re-evaluation on the part of the Church.

It must be noted that an individual, while in adolescence, stands at the greatest distance from his cultural, ethnic and religious group. It is now that his standards for mate selection begin to be operative. The prevailing idea of romantic love with choices freed from parental and group norms leads to an increase in mixed marriages, which bring further deep-rooted implications for the group. The failure of American Society, as a whole, to reflect the proper images of the wife and mother, and emphasizing the glamour girl as the epitome of womanhood, adversely influences the Orthodox young person in search for a proper mate. Says Otto Piper, "A serious consequence of the modern outlook is a crippling of the ability to love, a fact that goes far beyond the erotic sphere, affects the social life of our day."¹³

Various subgroups from the various Orthodox national groups have been successful in maintaining the extended family system. The Syrian community still maintains a strong extended kinship system even though marked by separation into Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant divisions. The important factor is identifying with the Syrian community as a whole and especially with the larger family group from which one descends. Many Syrian parishes are practically a kinship system in themselves, with almost everyone related in one way or another.

The Kastorians, a subgroup from area of Kastoria, Greece, represent the same strong kinship system here in the United States, with a strong endogamy which only now is starting to show some signs of strain. This subgroup has demonstrated an amazing ability to preserve a patrilineal tradition which had, up to the present, a fixed and accepted place for its young people. The father's nameday is the highlight of the year, whereupon an open house, is held and all members of the Kastorian group are expected to come. The son's nameday is also celebrated in the same manner. It is interesting to see the adult members of the larger community coming to pay their respects to the young boys. There is something valuable here which should not be lost. Further research is certainly required in this whole area.

Life within the Melting Pot

One of the major concepts in regards to life in America, is that America is a melting pot, that ultimately, all of the peoples touching her shores will be, in a short time, transmuted into that broadly illusive, generic term "Americans," losing their cultural values and being assimilated into the broad stream of American life. Originally, immigrants, in 1800, were allowed complete freedom so long as they made an economic contribution to the country. At the turn of the century, the melting pot theory prevailed and considerable pressures existed to assimilate various national groups. After World War I, however, this process was replaced by an even more drastic policy called the "Americanization theory." A strongly ethnocentric post-war feeling arose which regarded the foreign-born as inferior and hyphenated Americans whose primary loyalties were to a foreign country. This was a program negative in its emphasis upon surrender of religions, cultural and political beliefs without substituting anything adequate, on the premise that American culture was superior to any other. This, fortunately, was succeeded by the theory of cultural pluralism, which allowed each group to maintain its own unique cultural life without interference and that the life of the nation would be enriched by the cultural contribution of each group. However, this theory requires a constant replenishing by additional immigrants from abroad. This of course, was terminated by the passage of the United States Immigration Act of 1924, which limits the number of emigrants admitted into the United States to 2 % of the total number of citizens of that country resident here in 1890. This biased law, discriminating as it did against south Europeans, for all practical purposes terminated immigration to the United States from the Orthodox countries, except for a brief period after World War II when the Refugee Act of 1950 allowed significantly a large number of refugee people to enter. It meant, literally, that the various Orthodox groups could not be significantly increased any longer by immigration but could expect only a natural increase from within the group itself through intramarriage and raising children.

Significant also is the fact that the age distribution of the Orthodox immigrants showed that over 90 % of them were between the ages of 15 through 44, during the peak immigration years

up to 1924.¹⁴ This indicates that suddenly, now, an abnormally large segment of our foreign-born population is nearing the end of its life span. The implications of this for the future values and maintenance factors of the churches as ethnic communities is very far-reaching.

Also far-reaching are the implications of the immigrant's motivation in coming to the United States. By far the dominant motive of almost all the Orthodox immigrant groups, with the exception of, perhaps, the Syrian, was to earn sufficient funds with which to return to settle in their native lands. As a result, the early immigrants were not particularly interested either in adjusting to the values of the country or even learning its language, and to seek out long-term investments and business opportunities. This old-world-mindedness, from one point of view, was a real hedge against assimilation and, to a lesser degree, even of acculturation. It was only after the immigrant started having a family and putting down roots that this idea of returning to the old country gradually diminished and finally vanished during the early thirties. The moment this idea of return was abandoned marks the beginning when adjustment and acculturation commenced in earnest.

Because the immigrant did not come to stay but only to work and return to the homeland, and also, because he could not afford passage for wife and children, the result was that the Orthodox immigrant came to this country alone. The figures available indicate an extremely high ratio of male to female. In the instance of the Russian groups, the break-down showed 86 % male to 14 % female.¹⁵ The Greek figures were even higher, 87.9 % male to 12.1 % female.¹⁶ Albanians showed a ratio of 444 males to 100 females in 1920. The Syrian and, to a lesser degree, the Rumanians, are the only groups that evidenced a more equal balance of male to female.¹⁷ Though the Census of Religious Bodies taken in 1926 shows a leveling off of this tendency,

Ratio of male to female

Greeks	192.9 to 100
Rumanians	144.5 to 100
Albanians	294. to 100
Bulgarians	132.5 to 100
Russians	114.9 to 100

the discrepancy would indicate a deeper, more serious condition resulting in a high leakage factor and withdrawal from the group, on the one hand, or possibly, a very high intermarriage rate, on the other. These large groups of single men, without women, could well be expected to seek out female companionship wherever it could be found. A very high rate of intermarriage, the most sensitive index of assimilation, did take place and thus we see the patterns of ethnic and religious identification being grossly affected from the very beginning of our history in the United States.

Counterbalancing somewhat the assimilative tendencies of intermarriage was the low rate of literacy among the Orthodox emigrant groups. Coming largely out of a peasant class with almost 90 % of the original immigrants having no formal schooling, the immigrant was shut out by his illiteracy from some of the contacts and experiences which might have accelerated acculturation and eventually even assimilation. This same factor of illiteracy was also to work against them in terms of their relation with their children, who, by law, were compelled to attend school. There was much tension between the world of a child born in America and his insistence upon identification with the American community, and his parents, who were culturally isolated and lived and were motivated by the values of a society which they knew abroad and which they were resolved to maintain. This problem was further heightened by attendance at church services which were in an idiom further removed from the child. In most instances, the ritual language was not the spoken tongue of the people, for example, old Slavonic in the Slavonic churches, and the patristic and Alexandrian form of Greek used in the Greek services. Complicating matters even further was the status situation of the Orthodox immigrant. In the beginning he was looked down upon by the earlier immigrant groups and native Americans. They were discriminated against and generally held in low repute. The Bogardus test of Social Distances used by Sherif and Sherif in 1926 and as late as 1946 to test the feelings of the larger community towards minority groups, showed Syrians and Greeks ranked just above the Jews, Mexicans and Orientals, out of thirty-six ethnic groupings used in 1926.¹⁸ There is no question that the positions would probably be significantly modified today but this study pointed out areas of insecurity and inferiority that would affect the offspring of the immigrant seeking status in a country which he considered his own. A study, along the lines

of Irwin Childs's, *Italian or American* (New Haven, 1943), would give insight into this difficult area. Mr. Childs reports three types of second generation Italians: rebel, member of the in-groups, apathetic. This author, after considering all of the factors hindering assimilation, concludes that the degree of rapidity with which the Italian ethnic stock is disappearing is remarkable. This, in a group as large as the Italian, which contains a million and a half foreign-born Italians and six million of Italian descent, must give us, who are numerically so much smaller, serious pause for reflection, if Mr. Childs's assumptions are correct. Joseph S. Roucek, who has had much experience with ethnographic studies, in an article entitled, "The Passing of American Czechoslovaks," notes that "it is certain that with the passage of the older generation, will pass also the use of the Czech and Slovak language and institutions in the United States."

In the situation of the Orthodox peoples, several forces are at work which should be noted and which have been at work either towards maintaining the group ends or destroying the texture of the particular culture.

The Communist Revolution was one factor that affected adversely the self-image of the Russian here. The unfavorable reaction by the American people to this movement certainly has damaged the self-image which the Russian young person here would like to have of himself and, undoubtedly, must have accelerated the deterioration of the Russian ethnic pattern in life. This must also certainly be the case, especially aggravated today, because of the ideological conflict between east and west that prevails. This would apply to all groups that proceed out of ironcurtain countries, Russians, Bulgarians, Albanians, Serbians, Ukrainians. The teaching of ethnic languages has passed out of practically every one of the Orthodox churches with the exception of the Greek. According to "Pravda," a semi-weekly newspaper published by the Russian Brotherhood here, only ten schools taught Russian in 1930.¹⁹ There might be some slight increase because of the recent influx of Russian emigres. A Russian High school is operating now in New York City. The Rumanian language is taught in only one parish. The Greek churches, by contrast, continue to maintain Greek schools in almost every one of the four hundred parishes, in addition to a growing system of parochial schools.

What accounts in part for the difference is the strong ethnic solidarity that has marked the Greek throughout the long centuries of slavery. His religion and the dream of a free Greece were the very factors which alone sustained him. Coupled to an identification with the glory of ancient Greece, renewed again by the struggle against the Axis forces, during the Second World War, there are some strong maintainance factors much more apparent within the Greek group which are not so easily recognizable in the others.

Another factor is that foreign language instruction in the other Orthodox groups has not been available for a long time. This is significant, for many authorities hold that the degree to which immigrant groups have discarded their native tongue is a significant index of assimilation. The same observation may also be made as to the persistence of a foreign language press.²⁰

Lowrie Nelson, in his very provocative article, "Speaking of Tongues," states that, "to persist a language requires a large population." He cites that among eighteen language patterns, Spanish and French, both of which have large populations, have remained quite high in the third generation or 38.7 % and 36.7 % respectively. The lowest of the eighteen groups studied is Greek, which registers only 2.3 % of the third generation speaking the language.²¹ Nelson considers this an important variable in the index of assimilation. This might account for what might already have happened in the smaller Orthodox groups. What is obvious is that we need research studies on ethnic groups which still maintain ethnic solidarity in many of the larger cities, on the processes that maintain cultural and social isolation despite tremendous pressures of assimilation. We must explore why 25 % of the grandchildren of the Dutch speak Dutch out of a total of 275,000 population, of whom 100,000 were born in Holland.²² While, on the other hand, out of six-and-one-half million Germans born in Germany, plus their descendents, only 18.7 % of the third generation speak its language.²³

We mention this variable because a full knowledge of the processes of adaption and acculturation and assimilation are necessary. Adaption, the adjustment every immigrant must make to his new condition and, though he adopts the language and part of the culture, he still preserves his own cultural identity, and acculturation, which is the impact of one culture upon another and the modifi-

cations which come about as the result of such impact, are necessary and inevitable steps which every immigrant group must go through. Sklare puts forth the interesting point that the rate of acculturation appears to depend, to a considerable degree, upon the tempo of social mobility, the movement of a person up and down in a class hierarchy.²⁴ Where mobility takes place too rapidly, there is a tendency for an institution to be outstripped in its adjustive efforts by its public. However, though we feel that acculturation is acceptable, assimilation should be prevented at all costs. Assimilation is that third stage where an individual no longer identifies with his cultural group.

With this as our premise, we would agree with Sklare that the ethnic community is first a Church which seeks to provide a scheme of salvation for its constituency.²⁵ It also has the additional task of preserving the sub-culture of the ethnic group life. Sklare introduces a very important concept that ethnic solidarity serves a new purpose, protection from **anomie**, the atomization and disorganization characteristic of present day society which results in a loss of feeling of social solidarity.²⁶ This concept, first put forth by Emile Durkheim, describes **anomie** as "a state of de-regulation and declassification... (a normlessness)" A state where all the advantages of social influence are lost... moral education has to be recommenced, the kind of world that comes to us out of the works of Kafke, Sartre, Camus and Faulkner, where, at the center, stands the isolated individual alone and uprooted. This concept of **anomie** is one of tremendous significance and importance for the ethnic community. Louis Wirth describes the ethnic community as a spiritual ghetto whose significance is "the anchoring of each (of us) to a milieu, that, if it is not fostered, is, at any rate, least not desired." These ghettos do not need walls or gates, but the very nature of man himself demands it. Wirth is speaking here of the social proximity which man must have with his fellow human beings if he is to survive.²⁷

There is danger in advancing the preservation of the ethnic community solely as a bulwark against **anomie** or as the bearer and maintainer of the sub-culture, for, very easily, secularism can slip in, as indeed it already has. Sklare, discussing the compromise that has taken place with religious values with the secular growth of the social and recreational programs of the Synagogue and center,

calls these "survival techniques in a conflict society."²⁸ We can see the same forces at work in the Orthodox congregation, gnawing and corroding away the spiritual essence of the church as a praying, worshipping fellowship.

Howard Polsky, writing about the Jewish population in Milwaukee, states "that less than 8 % of the total population retains Orthodoxy (Jewish) in theory and practice." One could well apply his following statement to the Orthodox Christian congregations. "The objective assessment of the changing religious trends among the Orthodox... is a wide-spread secularization of religious observances that is taking place among the Jews in America.²⁹ This, he says, raises huge new problems for the survival of Judaism. On the one hand, they face the scourge of secularism and, on the other, Bernard Weintraub questions whether they can maintain their identity against the threat of middle class assimilation.. much less attain the creative heights required for a civilization. These problems are identical for us also in the Orthodox Christian congregations.

The threat of assimilation for the Orthodox communities in the United States is, indeed, a very real one. As our children become members of the third generation, this threat will seem to diminish in the brilliance of "the principle of third generation interest." This theory is derived from the almost universal phenomenon that "what the son wishes to forget, the grandson wishes to remember." Marcus Hansen tells us, "Whenever any immigrant group reaches the third generation stage in its development, a spontaneous, almost irresistible impulse arises which forces the thought of many people... to interest themselves in that one factor which they have in common: the heritage of blood." We are reminded, however, that "the time will come when the membership shall dwindle... the constituency becomes thinned out as the third merges into the fourth and shades off into the fifth."³⁰

But the threat underlies and remains. Whether we can avoid the "third step" of assimilation depends on many factors which I shall briefly attempt to treat. One, the existence of segregated area studies show that spatial as well as social distance between members of a group is important. Christen Jonassen notes that a population tends to distribute itself within an area so as to achieve the greatest efficiency in realizing the values they hold

dear. There is indicated a relationship between the size of a group within a given physical area.³¹ There are grave implications here for the smaller Orthodox groups and the isolated family units living apart from other members. This implies assimilation for everyone living a given distance away from a church and others of his group. What happens, for example, to the Bulgarian church when its church in Madison, Illinois," has territorial boundaries extending all the way to the Pacific Ocean? What is the potential of some two to two and one half million people divided into some eighteen different groups and jurisdictions, to satisfy their need for spatial and social proximity?

We must take into account, also, that because a person is born into an ethnic community does not mean that he identifies with his faith in the proper way. Father Fichter's threefold typology, nuclear, model and dormant, parishioner has become classic.³² If we apply this typology, what really remains of the two or two-and-one-half million Orthodox?

Second, the kind of education we shall be able to provide for ourselves and our children in regard to both religion and total culture is an important variable. The type of theological education and other qualities with we can provide which future priests, also has great bearing.

This, The mixed marriage, as we have said, is the most sensitive index of assimilation. It is an area that requires our full attention, for we are here at our most vulnerable. Mixed marriages are on the increase amongst all groups and shall continue to rise. Many factors contribute here, such as the decline in immigration, the horizontal and vertical mobility of the population, increased cultural contacts, all of these constitute "the melting pot" in reality.

Mixed marriages have a snowball effect in that children of this group married outside of the group. Also, the tendency of all young people, including Protestants and Catholics, have an increasingly tolerant attitude towards mixed marriage.

Ruby Jo Kennedy and A. Hollingshead have put forth the premise that, while strict endogamy is losing, religious endogamy is persisting, the net effect is that instead of one melting pot, we have three melting pots bubbling merrily side by side.³³

John L. Thomas, in a very significant article, refutes this pattern and supports the position that we are moving to a single melting pot. He quotes Roman Catholic statistics which show average mixed marriage rate as 26.2 %, but the significant factor is that the rate varies from 70 % in Raleigh, North Carolina, where there is a small Roman Catholic population, to a low of 10 % in El Paso, with a very high Roman Catholic population. His conclusion is that the proportion of Catholics in the total population greatly influences the intermarriage rate. "The scarcity of prospective marriage mates leads to a high rate of intermarriage wherever social and/or social status differences do not present occupational or social contacts."³⁴

Thomas also suggests a relationship between socio-economic status and intermarriage. The least intermarriages took place at the lower 8.5 % while the upper class and suburban population, were 17.9 % and 19.3 %, respectively.

Whether we hold a single or triple melting pot, there are serious portents indicated in these studies for the Orthodox groups.

Conclusion

The thoughts presented in this paper have but one function, to provoke interest and concern for the implications they raise. This paper does not purpose to be scientific or exhaustive, its conclusions must certainly be revised. It is only a plea to provide the circumstances whereby discussion can take place, and, perhaps, the involvement of some effective means of analyzing and altering our society to the greater glory of God.

The Social Sciences offer to the churches a rich and as yet unutilized potential in developing tools, techniques and methods that certainly can aid in advancing "the abundant life," as outlined for us by the Lord. The Church must call upon every resource to assist her in her most significant task, that of creating the "nuclear" Christian, the developed Christian personality who has apprehended the vision of Christ in the world and attempts in his life to walk according to the precepts which Jesus laid out for

us. Ancient heresies in modern dress are more formidable than ever with the arch-heresy of secularism threatening to destroy the Church from within. The parish, which stands as the Church in microcosm, must be restructured so as to be able to withstand these corrosive inroads, to become again "the living Congregation of the Living God."

Urgent also is the buttressing of the Orthodox concept of the family which stands, perhaps, as one of the most valuable contributions that we have to make to American life. The temporal structure of our symbol system must be re-examined to become more functional and relevant in the life of atomic age Christians. Involved here is the whole concept of "relevance," so that the Christian gospel can once again be communicated. Included here must also be the concepts of organization and "change." What is a healthy organization in the religious sense, the matters of power structure and motivation and authority? These and other aspects must be closely examined and scrutinized from fresh viewpoints in order that the Holy Spirit, with our cooperation, may again, as in times past, pulsate and course through the revitalized Christian body.

FOOTNOTES

- 1) Fichter, Joseph. **Social Relations in an Urban Parish**. Chicago, 1954. p. 238.
- 2) Fichter. **Op. cit.** p. 240.
- 3) Blumer, Herbert. **Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's "The Polish Peasant in Europe and America."** Social Science Research Council, New York, 1939.
- 4) Parson, Talcott. "The Problems of Controlled Institutional Change," in **Essays in Sociological Theory**. Revised edition. Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1954.
- 5) Rosen, Bernard C. "Race, Ethnicity and Achievement," in **American Sociol. Review**: Jan 1959. pp. 47-60.
- 6) Piper, Otto. **Biblical View of Sex and Marriage**. Scribner, New York, 1960. Piper attributes the earliest roots of change to the western emphasis on sex in the 19th century. The patriarchal family gradually disinte-

grated under Protestant influence, as the reformers' emphasis was based upon the personal nature of faith.

- 7) See Talcott Parson's essay, "Kinship System of Contemporary U. S.," in **Essays in Sociological Theory**, pp. 177-196.
- 8) Tannous, Afif. "Acculturation of an Arab-Syrian Community in the Deep South," in **Amer. Sociol. Review**: v. 8, June 1943. pp. 264-271.
- 9) Parsons. **Op. cit.** p. 185.
- 10) Bardis, Panos D. "A Comparative Study in Familism," in **Rural Sociology**: v. 24, Dec. 1959. pp. 263-371.
- 11) Parsons. **Op. cit.** p. 193.
- 12) Riesman, David; N. Glazen, R. Denney. **Lonely Crowd**. Doubleday, Garden City, 1953. p. 297.
- 13) Piper **Op. cit.**
- 14) The following table from the **Statistical Yearbook of Greece**, v. 1, Athens, 1930, shows population and age distribution of immigrants to the U. S. from Greece, 1869-1924:

Under 14 years	15-44	45 & over
25,867	456,761	17,835
5.17 %	91.27 %	3.56 %

- 15) Davis, Jerome. **The Russian Immigrant**. New York, 1922.
- 16) **Statistical Yearbook of Greece**, v. 1. Athens, 1930.
- 17) Brown, Francis J. & J. S. Roucek. **One America**. 6th printing, New York, 1949.
- 18) Sherif and Sherif. **An Outline of Social Psychology**. Rev. ed., New York, 1956.
- 19) quoted in Chyz, Y. J. & J. S. Roucek. "The Russians in the United States," **Slavonic Review**, v. 17, Apr. 1939. pp. 638-658.
- 20) For example, the circulation of Chinese newspapers is approximately the same as the Chinese population in the United States.
- 21) Nelson, Lowrie. in **Amer. Journal of Sociology**, v. 11, 1948. pp. 202-210.
- 22) Taft, Donald R. & Richard Robbins, edd. **Report on World Population Migrations**. Ronald Press, New York, 1955. pp. 25-27.
- 23) "The Effect of War on Minority Groups," in **Amer. Sociol. Review**: Feb. 1943. pp. 15-22.
- 24) Sklare, Marshall. **Conservative Judaism**. Glencoe, Ill., 1955. p. 26.
- 25) Sklare **Op. cit.** p. 34. The opening chapters of this book contain some very fascinating insights for our Orthodox groups.
- 26) **Ibid.** p. 34.
- 27) Wirth, Louis. **The Ghetto**. University of Chicago Press, 1928. For a good insight see also Kurt Lewin's **Resolving Social Conflicts**.
- 28) Sklare. **Op. cit.** p. 133.

- 29) Polsky, Howard W. "A Study of Orthodoxy," in **The Jews — Social Patterns of an American Group**, ed. by Marshall Sklare. pp. 334-335.
- 30) Hansen, Marcus Lee. "The Third Generation in America," in **Commentary**: v. 14, Nov. 1952. pp. 492-500.
- 31) Jonassen, C. T. "Cultural Variables in the Ecology of an Ethnic Group," in **Amer. Sociol. Review**: v. 14, Feb. 1949. pp. 32-41.
- 32) For a full description of this important typology read Fichter, J. S., **Social Relations in an Urban Parish**, part 1: "A Typology of Parishioners," pp. 9-79. Father Fichter divides American Catholics into 4 groups: Nuclear 5.7 %, Modal 31.3 %, Marginal 25.0 %, Dormant 38.0 %.
- 33) Kennedy, Ruby Jo Reeves. "Single or Triple Melting-Pot," "Intermarriage Trends in New Haven, 1870-1940," in **Amer. Journal of Sociology**: v. 39, Jan. 1944. pp. 331-339.
- 34) Thomas, John L. "Factor of Religion in the Selection of Marriage Mates," in **Amer. Sociol. Review**: v. 16, Aug. 1951. p. 481.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bardis, Panos D. "A Comparative Study of Familism." **Rural Sociology**. Dec. 1, 1959, p. 263.
- Blumenthal, Albert. **Small Town Stuff**. Chicago, 1932.
- Blumer, Herbert. **Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences: An Appraisal of Thomas and Znaniecki's, The Polish Peasant in Europe and America**. Social Science Research Council, New York, 1939.
- Bogardus, Emory S. "Cultural Pluralism & Acculturation." **Sociology & Social Research**, XXXIV, Nov., 1949, Pp. 125-59.
- Bossard, James. "Nationality & Nativity as Factors in Marriage." **American Sociological Review**. Vol. IV, pp. 792-98; Dec., 1939.
- Brown, Francis J. and Roucek, Joseph S. **One America**. Prentice Hall, New York, 1949. 6th Printing.
- Burgees, Thomas. **Greeks in America**. Boston, 1913.
- Carpenter, Niles and Katz, David. **A Study of Acculturation In The Polish Groups of Buffalo. 1923-1928**, University of Buffalo Studies, 1929.
- Census of Canada**. 1951. Vol. II
- Census of Canada**, 1957. Vol. II
- Census of Religious Bodies**, 1926, Vol. 1-2 Bureau of Census.
- Chyz, Y. J. & Roucek, Joseph S. "Russians in the United States." **Slavonic Review**, Vol. XVII, April, 1939, 638-658.

- Chyz, Yaroslav J. "Number, Distribution and Circulation of the Foreign Language Press in the United States." *Interpreter Releases*, Vol. XX. Common Council for American Unity, Oct. 13, 1943, pp. 290-97.
- Cope, Olibert. *Symbolism in the Bible and the Church*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1959.
- Davis, Jerome. *Russian Immigrant*. MacMillan, 1922.
- Davis, Jerome. *Russian and Ruthenian in America: Bolsheviks or Brothers*. New York, 1922.
- Dohrenwend, Bruce. "Egoism, Altruism, Anomie and Fatalism: A Conceptual Analysis of Durkheim's Types." *American Soc. Review*, Aug. 1954, pp. 466-473.
- Drachaler, Julius. *Intermarriage in N. Y. C.* "A Statistical Study of the Amalgamation of European People." New York, 1921.
- Fichter, Joseph H., S. J. *Parochial School, A Sociological Approach*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960.
- Fichter, Joseph H., S. J. *Southern Parish; Dynamics of a City Church*, Vol. I. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1951.
- "The Foreign Born and their American Born Children," *Interpreter Release*, Common Council for American Unity. Vol. XIX, Oct. 19, 1942.
- Francis, M. N. "The Russian Mennonites: From Religious to Ethnic Group," *American Journal of Sociol.* Vol. LIV, Sept. 1948, pp. 101-107.
- Calitzi, Christiane A. *A Study of Assimilation Among the Rumanians in the United States*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1929.
- Gordon, Albert I. *Jews in Transition*, University of Minnesota Press, 1949.
- Gordon, Loland J. "Immigration from Turkey," *Sociology & Social Research*, Vol. XV, Nov.-Dec., 1930, pp. 151-66.
- Halick, Wasyl. *Ukrainian in the United States*, Chicago, 1937.
- Handlin, Oscar. *American People in 20th Century*, Harvard, 1954.
- Hansen, Marcus Lee. "The Third Generation in America," *Commentary*, Nov. 1952, Vol. 14, pp. 492-500.
- Herberg Will. *Protestant, Catholic, Jew*, Anchor Book, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1960.
- Hirsch, Walter. "Assimilation as a Concept & as a Process," *Social Forces*, Vol. XXI, Oct. 1942, pp. 35-39.
- Hitte, Phillip K. *Syrians in America*,
- Hollingshead, A. B. "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates." *Amer. Soc. Review*, Vol. 15, Oct. 1950, pp. 619-27; Vol. 19, June, 1954. p. 244. *American Journal of Sociol.* Vol. LVII, Nov. 1951, pp. 249-255.
- INTERNATIONAL MIGRATIONS, Vol. I — *Statistics*, edited by Willcox, Walter. Vol. II — *Interpretations*, 1931, pp. 521-580; National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jonassen, Christen T. "Cultural Variables in the Ecology of an Ethnic Group," *American Sociol. Review*, Vol. XIV, Feb., 1949 pp. 32-41.

- Johnson, F. Ernest. **Religious Symbolics**, "Inst. for Relig. & Soc.Studies." Harper & Brothers, New York, 1955.
- Kennedy, Ruby Jo. "Single or 'Triple Melting-Pot," in **Amer. Journal of Sociology**: v. 39, Jan. 1944. pp. 331-339.
- Landis, Judsen. "Marriages of Mixed & Non-Mixed Religious Faiths." **American Soc. Review**, Vol. 14, p. 401.
- Langer, Susanne K. **Philosophy in a New Key**, New American Library, 1942.
- Lee, Rose Hann. "Assimilation of Chinese," **Amer. Sociol. Review**, Vol. 14, p. 44-53.
- Leslie, Charles, editor, **Anthropology of Folk Religion**, Vintage Books, New York, 1960.
- Lensa, William A. & Voght, von Z., editors; **Reader in Comparative Anthropology**, Evanston, Ill., 1958.
- Lowry, Nelson, "Speaking of Tongues," **American Journal of Sociol.** Vol. LIV., Nov. 1948, pp. 202-10.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw. **Magic, Science and Religion**, Doubleday & Co., 1948.
- Marty, Martin E. **The New Shape of American Religion**, Harper & Brothers, N. Y., 1959.
- Meier, Dorothy L. and Bell, Wendell; "Anomia and Achievement of Life Goals," **American Soc. Review**, April, 1959.
- Miller, Lucian Hopkins, "A Study of the Syrian Communities of Greater N. Y.," New York.
- Misruchi, E. H. "Social Structure and Anomie in a Small City." **American Sociol. Review**, Oct., 1960, p. 645.
- "Mother Tongues of the Foreign Born White Population," **Interpreter Releases**, Foreign Language Information Service, Vol. IX, Apr. 1, 1932, pp. 65-70.
- Myers, Jerome K. "Assimilation of the Sociological & Social Systems of a Community"; **American Sociol. Rev.**, Vol. XV, June, 1950.
- Munch, Peter A. "Social Adjustment Among Wisconsin Norwegians," **American Sociol. Review**, Vol. XIV, Dec. 1949.
- Nelson, Lowrie. "Speaking of Tongues," in **American Journal of Sociology**, vol. 11, 1948. pp. 202-210.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. **The Social Sources of Denominationalism**, Living Age Books, Meridian, New York. 4 th print., 1960.
- Parsons, Talcott. **Essays in Sociological Theory**, Free Press, Revised Edition, 1954, Clencoe, Ill.
- Papanikolas, Helen Z. "The Greek of Carbon County," **Utah Historical quarterly**, Apr. 1954, Vol. 22, pp. 194-164.
- Piper, Otto; **Biblical View of Sex and Marriage**, Chas. Scribner, New. York, 1960.
- "Population, Nativity and Parentage of the White Population," "Mother Tongues by Nativity, Country of Origin and age." U. S. Bureau of Census, Washington, D. C., 1940.

- Reisman, David; Glazer, Nathan and Denney, Reuel. **The Lonely Crowd**; Yale University Press, Doubleday, 1953, Garden City, N. Y.
- "**A Report on World Population Migration**, Bibliography, George Washington University. 1956.
- Richard I. A. & Ogden, C. K. **The Meaning of Meaning**, Harcourt Brace & Co., London, 1948.
- Rosen, Bernard C. "Race, Ethnicity and Achievement," **American Sociol. Review**, Jan. 1959, pp. 189-202.
- Rosenthal, Erich; "Acculturation without Assimilation," **American Journal of Sociol.**, Nov. 1960, p. 275.
- Roucek, Joseph. "American Finns," **Interpreter Releases**, Foreign Language Information Service, Vol. XVI. Sept. 27, 1939, pp. 373-91.
- Roucek, Joseph. "Passing of American Czechoslovaks." **Amer. Journal of Sociol.** Vol. XXXIX, March, 1934, pp. 611-25.
- Roucek, Joseph. "Yugoslav Immigrants in America," **Amer. Journal of Sociol.**, Vol. 40, March, 1935, pp. 602-11.
- Sklare, Marshall. **Conservative Judaism**, Glencoe, Ill., 1955.
- Sklare, Marshall. **The Jews — Social Patterns of an American Group**. Free Press, 1958.
- Sherif and Sherif. **An Outline of Social Psychology**, Harper, 1956, Revised Edition.
- Stroup, Herbert. "Social Change in Greece." Vol. 39, **Sociology & Social Research**. P. 240.
- Taft, Donald R. & Robbins, Richard. **International Migrations**, Ronald Press, New York, 1955.
- Tannous, Afif I. "Acculturation of an Arab-Syrian Community in the Deep South," **American Sociological Review**, VIII, June, 1943, pp. 264-71.
- Thomas, John L. "Factor of Religion in the Selection of Marriage Mates." in **Amer. Sociol. Review**. Vol. 16, Aug. 1951.
- Truedly, Mary B. "Formal Organization and the Americanization Process with Special Reference to the Greeks in Boston." **American Sociol. Review**, Vol. XIV, Feb., 1949, pp. 44-55.
- U. S. Bureau of Census. **Census of 1950**, Vol. 4, Part 2.
- "U. S. 1 Immigration and Naturalization Service." Annual Report, 1958-1959, Washington, D. C.
- Vernon, Olen. "An Inquiry into the Scalability of Church Orthodoxy." **Sociology and Social Research**, Vol. 39, 1954-1955, p. 324.
- Whelpton, Pascal K. "Population Change in U. S." **American Journal of Sociol.** May, 1930 & 1932.
- Wilson, Logan. & Kolb, William L. editors, **Sociological Analysis**, New York: Wirth, Louis. **The Ghetto**. University of Chicago Press, 1928.
- Yinger, J. Milton. **Religion, Society and the Individual**, MacMillan, New York, 1957.
- Young, Pauline. "Russian Molokan Community in Los Angeles," **American Journal of Sociol.** XXXV. Nov. 1929, 393-402.

A Case Study :

THE MINNEAPOLIS RUSSIAN COMMUNITY IN TRANSITION*

Alex Simirenko

There are two distinct Russian communities in Minneapolis, Minnesota. One is composed of the "old" immigrants (who came prior to World War I) and their children, who are united around the St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Church; the second one is composed of the "new" political immigrants from Russia (who came after World War II), who cluster around the St. Panteleimon's Russian Orthodox Church.¹⁾ The community of the St. Mary's Church is the larger of the two, consisting of 930 family units. It has a proud and distinguished history of eighty years and is considered to be one of the prosperous and outstanding Russian communities in the United States. Since World War II, the community has undergone considerable change from the form in which it had originally crystalized at the turn of the century. To trace this transformation is the primary object of the present article.

The first person to arrive in Minnesota and later to become one of the founders of the Russian community was George Homzik. He was 24 years of age when he arrived in 1877.²⁾ A decade later a community had been established and its members were building their own church. All the people of the early community were of a ho-

* The study on which the present article is based was preformed in the spring and summer of 1960. Thanks are due to the Very Rev. Leonard Soroka, Gary Miller, Noel Iverson, Constance and Mary Tarasar, Natalie Brinda, Pat Pilkey, Sonia Reshetar, and Roberta Weinard for their help in the study. I am deeply indebted to Professor Don Martindale, who was consulted during the study.

1) A more detailed description of the two communities is found in "The Social Structure of the Minneapolis Russian Community," **Proceedings of the Minnesota Academy of Science for 1959**. (Minneapolis, 1960) pp. 79-86.

2) Fourth Decennial Census of Minnesota, 1895, Ward 1.; The Fifth Decennial Census of Minnesota lists him as coming to Minneapolis in 1878.

mogeneous cultural background. The great majority came from the villages of Beherov, Komlos, and Stebnik within the Austro-Hungarian empire which are part of Czechoslovakia at the present.³

The first members of the Russian Community of Minneapolis had belonged to the Uniate Church. They were encouraged to build a church of their own by the first resident Uniate priest in the United States, Father John Volianski. The St. Mary's church was completed in 1889, November 17 of the same year marked the arrival of the community's first pastor, Father Alexei G. Toth (Tovt) from the Prague Diocese.⁴) The name of Father Toth has become a legend in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church in the United States. On March 25, 1891, the Minneapolis community was converted to Russian Orthodoxy, and Bishop Vladimir, the Russian Orthodox Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands, received the parish under his jurisdiction. Father Toth was transferred to Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, in 1893, where he died on April 26, 1904.⁵) The Minneapolis community was the first Uniate parish to transfer its allegiance to the Russian Orthodoxy; it has paved the way for many such conversions among the Uniates in the United States. In 1950, it had been estimated that the number of such transfers comprised more than 225,000 souls.⁶)

The Minneapolis parish has also become renowned in the Orthodox circles for its Russian Missionary School (1897-1905) and the first Russian Ecclesiastical Seminary (1905-1912) which was established and supported by the Holy Synod. The history of the Minneapolis community is a story of struggle, hardship, and success. From an initial state of extreme poverty the former Carpathian peasants who composed it have succeeded in creating one of the most prosperous Orthodox parishes in America. The present situa-

3) Rev. John Dzubay, *The Light of Orthodoxy, The Sixty-sixth Anniversary of St Mary's Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, Minneapolis, Minnesota*. (Minneapolis, 1953), p. 3.

4) Rev. John Nedzeinitzky, "The Fiftieth Anniversary of the Russian Orthodox Colony in Minneapolis," *Golden Jubilee Album of the St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church* (Minneapolis, 1937), pp. 16-17.

5) *Ibid.*, pp. 17-20.

6) *The Russian-American Orthodox Kalendar for 1950*. (Wilkes-Barre, Pa.: Svet, 1950), p. 216.

tion of the parish is recounted by Father John Dzubay in the following terms:

- "1) A beautiful, spacious, artistically decorated church edifice, Byzantine in style, architecture and character.
- ...2) A new magnificent School and Parish Center building of modern architecture, built at a cost of nearly \$ 300,000.
- ...3) A ten acre parish cemetery plot, on which is built a beautiful chapel, a brick edifice; there in peaceful slumber rest over 1500 parishioners and Orthodox faithful. ...4) Two modern, up-to-date parish homes — built about 8 years ago.
- ...5) An old, remodeled and redecorated parish home, located next to the church.6) And, a six-lot parking space, two blocks from the church. ...The worth of the entire property is estimated at about one million dollars."
- 7)

Several members of the community have received regional and national prominence. Perhaps the most prominent former member of the community is John S. Reshetar, Jr., Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington at Seattle. Judge Paul J. Jaroscak has been serving as a Hennepin County District Judge since 1951.⁸⁾ In 1954, Harold Kalina was elected to the state senate and at the age of 26 became the youngest senator in the Minnesota legislature.⁹⁾ Three prominent Minneapolis attorneys came out of the St. Mary's community: Peter Barna, William G. Kohlan, and Andrew G. Kohlan.¹⁰⁾

The Russian Settlement as An Ethnic Community

The majority of Slavic settlers in the United States came at a time when an emerging American industrialism had created vast demands for unskilled laborers. They were accepted into a majority community to preform pariahlike tasks at the height of the industrial revolution in the 1890's. However, the presence of strangers with a unique way of life in the midst of the majority community is often experienced as a threat to the way of life of the majority.

7) V. Rev. John Dzubay, "St. Mary's 73rd Anniversary," **Summer Festival and Picnic Souvenir Book**. (Minneapolis, 1960), p. 5.

8) **Minneapolis Star**, "Jaroscak is District Judge," May 28, 1951.

9) **Minneapolis Star**, December 1, 1956 and December 11, 1958.

10) **Minneapolis Star**, "Town Toppers," January 18, 1954 and **Minneapolis Star**, "Town Toppers," July 3, 1956.

The more appealing and inviting the stranger is, the greater the threat he represents to the majority community, since his very existence proves that other solutions to life's problems are possible. Hence, the strangers are looked upon with a mixture of fear, resentment, hostility, and prejudice, while at the same time they are viewed with permissiveness for the services and the values which they render to the community.

It is this mixture of the feelings of hostility and permissiveness that tends to favor the segregation of the strangers into their own semi-isolated communities. In the meantime, the strangers in the new land tend to find that the meaning of their lives is being lost unless they can restore it in association with their countrymen. Out of pressures from the majority community and with the conscious effort on the part of the strangers themselves, the ethnic community is born.¹¹⁾

The ethnic community tends to develop its own way of life around whatever central institution holds greatest promise of keeping the community together. The Russian community in Minneapolis, like many other ethnic communities in the United States, transformed its church into such a central institution around which the whole life of the community revolved. The studies of Russian immigrants in other parts of the United States have also confirmed the importance of the church as a unifying institution for the Russian settlers.¹²⁾ The community's distinct way of life is preserved by a system of stratification within it. Persons of prestige, influence, and authority within the community protect and sanction the cultural uniqueness of its people.

In the ethnic community the system of stratification tends gradually to be destroyed with the rise of the second and third genera-

¹¹⁾ The principles of formation of the ethnic community are excellently discussed by Don Martindale in *The American Social Structure*. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), pp. 377-431.

¹²⁾ See: Jerome Davis, *The Russian Immigrant*. (New York: McMillan, 1922); Jerome Davis, *The Russians and Ruthenians in America*. (New York: George H. Doran Co., 1922); George Martin Day, *The Russians in Hollywood*. (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1934); Pauline V. Young, *The Pilgrims of Russian-Town*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932); and Lillian Sokoloff, *The Russians in Los Angeles*. (Los Angeles: University of Sythern California Press, 1918).

tions. The economic and professional advancement of these new generations brings about cultural dispersal as well, with the concomitant assimilation of the new generations into the larger American community and the acceptance of the goals and values of the majority community.¹³⁾

The life in the Minneapolis Russian community has already been transformed under the pressures of the new generations. Among these transformations we note the introduction of the English language services (In 1951) and the changing of the Sunday School along the lines of the Protestant influence in which the children are taught to reason out their religious beliefs rather than to experience them. The change, however dramatic, has still been considered too slow by a considerable segment of the members of the community. In consequence, at the present time many distinguished families of the St. Mary's church have brothers and sisters who are no longer members of the community.

The Study

The process of the transformation of loyalties by members of the community is a gradual one. The change occurs in stages: (1) It is initiated with the increasing participation in the affairs of the majority community, (2) it progresses by development of interests and friendships in the outside community, (3) and it is terminated with the rejection of the parents' way of life. To study the details of this process of transformation, families from three different groups have been randomly selected for personal interviews. A pre-coded questionnaire and a schedule were used to control and facilitate the interviewing procedure.

The first group of persons sampled consisted of the old people in the community — of whom either wife or husband, or both, were born in Europe and thus representing the first generation in this country. The second group was composed of their children forming the second and third generation. The third group was represented by the persons who were once members of the St. Mary's parish but have since left it and joined the greater American community.

¹³⁾ The problem of generations is discussed by Karl Manheim in *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1952), pp. 276-322.

The first sample group consisted of twenty-nine families in which the median ages of the wives were between 55 and 59; and the median ages of the husbands were between 60 and 64. The second group consisted of forty-two families in which the median ages of the wives were between thirty-five and thirty-nine years; and the median ages of husbands were between forty and forty-four. The third group was represented by thirty-four families with similar median ages as the second group.

Selected Findings

One of the most revealing findings pertains to the intermarriage rate of the members of the community with the "outsiders." There was only one family among the third group in which both husband and wife were Slavic. There were as many as seventeen families in the second group, and twenty-six in the first group in which both wife and husband were Slavic and Orthodox. It should be pointed out, however, that there were many families which continued to belong to the church though one member was an "outsider." This indicates that other factors besides intermarriage affect the decision as to whether the family will remain or terminate its participation in the community. The statistical findings, however, point to a strong association between membership in the church and the factor of intermarriage.

Table 1. The Origin of the Wife in the Three Groups

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
Slavic	27	93.1	30	71.4	16	47.1	73	69.5
Non-Slavic	2	6.9	12	28.6	18	52.9	32	30.5
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0
$\chi^2 = 13.9$		2 d.f.	.001 < p					

Table 2. The Origin of the Husband in the Three Groups

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
Slavic	28	96.6	29	69.0	19	55.9	76	72.4
Non-Slavic	1	3.4	13	31.0	15	44.1	29	27.6
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0
$\chi^2 = 13.3$		2 d.f.	.005 < p		< .001			

The Minneapolis community is justly proud of the fact that many intermarriages actually bring converts to the Orthodox faith. However, the study suggests that the actual number of conversions is smaller than the church roster indicates. To be sure although one member of the family remains in the church and pays family dues (sixteen rather than the eleven dollars for a single person), their spouses need not necessarily regard themselves members the church. This kind of nominal participation of membership is revealed in the analysis of the second generation families. Of the forty-two families interviewed, there were twenty-five (59.5 %) families in which either the wife or the husband was non-Orthodox. Of this number there were ten wives and six husbands who did not consider themselves members of the church.

The above discussion is further illuminated by the response to the question of whether the parents of the second generation (in the second group) sent their children to the St. Mary's Sunday School or intended to when the children become old enough. Twenty-four families responded favorably but fifteen families, who at the present time belong to the St. Mary's church, have no intention of sending their children to the Sunday School.

Significant difference are also found in the ecological distribution of these families. The church and the community are traditionally located in the Northeastern area of Minneapolis, an area known as the habitation of the peoples from Central and Eastern Europe. Since its heaviest contingents were Polish, the area is often referred in town as the Polish area. In the past two decades the new generations born in this area have been moving to the suburbs directly adjoining the area of Northeast: Columbia Heights and Fridley. Some, in fact, move farther, crossing the river to the North of the city, while others have moved to the remoter suburbs of the South. Many of the interviews revealed the fact that the most face-saving and psychologically least distressing way of tearing oneself from the community was by moving away to the distant suburbs and then claiming distance as a reason for decreasing interaction. For a more meaningful statistical test the five different residence areas were combined into three:

Table 3. Ecological Distribution of the Three Groups

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
Northeast	25	86.2	24	57.1	7	20.6	56	53.3
Columbia Heights, Fridley and the North			11	26.2	8	23.5	19	18.1
Other Minneapolis areas and distant suburbs	4	13.8	7	16.7	19	55.9	30	28.6
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0
	$\chi^2 = 33.3$		4 d.f.		.001 < p			

Another major index of community belonging is the proportion of friendship choices within and outside the community. When we turn attention to the people chosen as friends or close associates to the families in all of the three groups, we note that while certain proportional differences exist they are not very significant. The majority of families in the three groups tend to associate more often with relatives and neighbors, rather than with their business associates. These findings are not surprising because of the relatively homogeneous cultural background of the three groups. The question does not tap their loyalties to their ethnic community.

Table 4. Favorite Family Associations

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
Kinroik and Neighbors	29	100.0	36	85.7	24	70.6	89	84.8
Business Associates			2	4.8	6	17.6	8	7.6
Both			4	9.5	4	11.8	8	7.6
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0

The question illiciting information on church membership of close friends and associates is much more significant in distinguishing between the three groups:

Table 5. Church Membership of the Majority of Close Friends

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
St. Mary's	22	75.9	14	33.3	3	8.8	39	37.1
Other	7	24.1	28	66.7	31	91.2	66	62.9
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0
	$\chi^2 = 30.4$		2 d.f.				$.001 < p$	

More specific information was obtained about the church affiliation of friends when the church membership of the three best friends of the family was asked. It revealed that the families who broke with the St. Mary's parish also tended to dispense with closer ties among those who remained in the church.

Table 6. The Number of Best Friends Non-Members of St. Mary's Church

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
None	15	51.7	7	16.7	0	0	22	21.0
One out of Three	5	17.2	11	26.2	2	5.9	18	17.1
Two out of Three	6	20.7	10	23.8	6	17.6	22	21.0
All Three	3	10.3	14	33.3	26	76.5	43	41.0
Total	29	99.9*	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.1*
	$\chi^2 = 38.7$		6 d.f.				$.001 < p$	

* Due to rounding

Claims of friendship with at least one pastor of the St. Mary's Church by the parishioners from the first and second generation do not vary significantly. As expected, the families who ceased belonging to the church also ceased associating with its pastors.

Table 7. Claims of Friendship with one or more pastors

	Group I		Group II		Group III		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
Claim Friendship	15	51.7	23	54.8	2	5.9	40	38.1
Deny Friendship	14	48.3	19	45.2	32	94.1	65	61.9
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	34	100.0	105	100.0
	$\chi^2 = 22.5$		2 d.f.		.001 < p			

Of great interest to the Orthodox clergy and laymen is the present religious loyalty of those who terminated their ties with Orthodoxy. It was found that of the twenty-three families in the Protestant churches as many as fourteen are affiliated with the various Lutheran denominations. The fact is explained by the preponderance of Scandinavian Lutherans within the Minneapolis majority community.

Table 8. Present Religious Affiliation of the Third Group

Affiliation	Number of Families	Percent
Protestant	23	67.6
Roman Catholic	6	17.6
No Church	5	14.7
Total	34	99.9 (due to rounding)

The Minneapolis Russian community during its long history has established as many as sixteen major clubs, brotherhoods and organizations. In the old days each member used to belong and participate in a good number of these clubs. Brotherhoods were especially noted for their appeal among the immigrants since they tended to replace the extended family which was left behind in Europe. After 1936, when the St. Mary's "R" Club, Chapter 94, was organized, only one major organization became established. This was the Veterans Association, established shortly after the end of the war. Outside of these two organizations, which remain relatively strong to the present day, the rest of the associations have been losing their influence in the community.

With the end of World War II there has been a gradual shift away from many of these old time associations. The awareness of the shift was already verbalized by the members in 1951 in the booklet published during the celebration of the 64th anniversary of the church. After listing a series of clubs, organizations, brotherhoods and committees there appears the following statement:¹⁴

“Every Orthodox Christian should be a member of at least one of the listed organizations. Which one are you connected with?”

Recapitulation

The ethnic community is formed within the majority community by persons of foreign origin who carry on a semi-autonomous way of life. The situation bringing about the formation of the ethnic community involves a combination of receptivity and resistance. The attitudes of permissiveness and prejudice on the part of the majority community lead to the construction of partially closed ghetto-like minority systems which have little influence upon the majority and are in turn left to pursue their way of life in a new land.

It is difficult to maintain the ethnic community when the attitudes of hostility and prejudice on the part of the majority community begin to diminish. The task becomes even more arduous when the members of the community themselves fail to regard their way of life as unique from the majority community. The time comes when the children and grandchildren of the former stranger speak the language of the majority community, dress in the attire of the largest department store in town, and move out of the stigma-ridden original location of the ethnic community. Gradually the members of the once underprivileged minority attain and perform respectable jobs and services within the majority community and prove their loyalty to their new country by risking their lives in its military causes. In the course of all these activities they have come to accept the goals and values of the majority community.

¹⁴) *Souvenir Book of the 64th Anniversary Summer Festival and Picnic*. (Minneapolis, 1951), p. 46.

When this happens the existence of a truly intergrated ethnic community tends to come to an end. The process of the disintegration, however, is not a sudden one as the selected findings presented above tend to indicate. It is a gradual process in which some members of the second and third generation still remain attached to certain older values of their parents while others have already terminated their ties with the community.

When a comparison is made between the first and the second generation organizational participation we notice significant changes in the activites of men, but little or no significant change in the activities of women. The second generation of men has reduced its participation in the church organizations. The women have traditionally belonged to the Mothers Club or to the two women's societies — St. Mary's Russian Orthodox Church Women's Society and the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary Women's Society. The second generation women tend to enter the Mothers Club and a small number may then join either the "R" Club or the Russian Orthodox Church Women's Society.

Table 9. Membership in Church Organization of Men

Number of Organizations	Group I		Group II		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
None	10	34.5	27	64.3	37	52.1
One	7	24.1	9	21.4	16	22.5
Two to five	12	41.4	6	14.3	18	25.4
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	71	100.0
$x^2 = 7.8$	2 d. f.		$p = .02$			

Table 10. Membership in Church Organizations of Women

Number of Organizations	Group I		Group II		Total	
	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent	No. —	Percent
None	9	31.0	20	47.6	29	40.8
One	12	41.4	15	35.7	27	38.0
Two or Three	8	27.6	7	16.7	15	21.1
Total	29	100.0	42	100.0	71	99.9 (Due to rounding)
$x^2 = 2.4$	2 d. f.		$p = .50$			

To say that there are forces tending to disintegrate Minneapolis Russian community, does not mean to say that the Orthodox faith is also disintegrating. Such a question was not a part of the present study. The various political moves which are presently being made to legitimize Orthodoxy as the fourth major faith in the United States will, if successful, make it a more acceptable faith to follow by the upcoming generations. Perhaps this is the supreme test of the religion of an ethnic group: to organize it in such manner that it does not collapse when the ethnic ghettos with which it may be associated for a time are destroyed.

The Unity of the Orthodox Church in America

Serge S. Verkhovskoy

Last June the primates of the Orthodox Churches in America decided to create an all-American standing episcopal conference or synod "for the consideration and resolution of common problems,, the coordination of efforts in matters of common concern, and the strengthening of the unity which is the essence of Orthodoxy" as it was said in the minutes. Eleven different commissions will be established by this synod. They will work in the fields of Christian education, theological schools, Orthodox chaplaincy in colleges, boy scout organizations, English translation of the services, chaplaincy in the armed forces, missionary activity and fund raising. One of these commissions will deal with relations of the Orthodox Church in America with other denominations. Another will follow civil legislation of the United States on church affairs. The Synod will direct the activity of the Council of Eastern Orthodox Youth Leaders of America.

One can but rejoice at the organization of the Pan-Orthodox synod. And we must wish it great success. Nevertheless this synod is only the first step toward final unification of Orthodoxy in America, and there are certainly many obstacles in obtaining this goal.

Many orthodox Christians understand the necessity of unity, and it is known to all how destructive the effect of this division of Orthodoxy is regarding the fruitfulness of church activity, church discipline, education, relation with other denominations, etc. However, indifference to the unity of Orthodoxy is widely spread. Behind this indifference, there is one of the most dangerous defects in the life of the Orthodox clergy and people in America: indifference to everything beyond the limits of parish life. Many Orthodox laymen and priests not only disregard whatever does not directly concern their parishes, but are even inclined to consider everything above parish life as dangerous for their parishes and not deserving confidence. Unity, cooperation and obedience to the central authorities

is often considered as harmful to the rights and interests of the parishes and particularly dangerous to their property rights... Among the bishops we also see a reticent attitude towards the problems of unification; the reasons for this reticence are probably various. But in any case it is the duty of the episcopate to lead the Church toward unity, a good example of which we see in the organization of the Synod.

We must also point out that the Orthodox of Western Europe and America are unfortunately accustomed to divisions. In Western Europe the Orthodox Church was never canonically organized because very few Orthodox lived there before the 1920's. In America there existed a strictly canonical organization before the Russian Revolution that created such a terrible turmoil in the Russian Church. Since the 1920's for forty years already a complete disunity reigns among the Orthodox in America. During this period almost 1½ generations have grown up. It is no wonder that the existence of numerous "jurisdictions" seems normal. It is dreadful that the people are so used to this evil. But even within some of these jurisdictions there is no unity. Parish separatism ruins church life. The canonical consciousness of many Orthodox approaches that of the Protestant Congregationalists, who recognize the full independence of each parish, the union of which has the form of a federation. These parishes recognize only those obligations which they willingly accept. Some Orthodox in America openly proclaim that the parishes not only have the right to oppose their rectors and bishops, but that the decisions of the general councils of the Church are not binding to them. Anarchical ideas poison the life of our Church. The episcopate often feels helpless in the face of this evil.

Not only does parish separatism lead to the denial of the necessity for unity, but nationalism does so even more strongly. Too many Orthodox either consider nation higher than Church or Orthodoxy as a national religion and sometimes even as a nationalistic form of Christianity. The intelligentsia and hierarchy share this idea no less than do the people; therefore it is difficult to overcome this deformation of the understanding of the relations between religion and nationality. From the point of view of church nationalism, the division of the church into national groups is the best form of its organization. This division is consciously asserted and

supported although it contradicts Orthodox canons and was condemned by the Constantinopolitan patriarch as the heresy of filetism.

The last obstacle in reaching the unity of Orthodox Churches in America is the existence of clergymen irregularly ordained. Experience shows that the majority of Orthodox churches refuse to be in communion with this clergy, but thousands of Orthodox recognize it. The reason for this acceptance is again nationalism: the people are ready to accept any hierarchy, even irregularly ordained if it is nationalistically minded. The Orthodox hierarchy would probably be willing to grant a regular ordination to this clergy for the sake of "economia."* We hope that this possibility will be used as it was by a bishop this year... A church with a falsely ordained hierarchy is in a position worse than in a schism: such a church has no apostolic succession of ministry and can be excommunicated from the Orthodox Church. This will necessarily also happen in America if the "self-ordained" hierarchy does not canonically regularize its position.

We have said that the newly-created Synod is only a first step towards the perfect organization of the Orthodox church in America. Cooperation between Orthodox jurisdictions is indeed highly desirable. But the very existence of many jurisdictions in one country contradicts the canons.

The Orthodox Church must be organized on the territorial principle which requires that there should be only one church organization or as we now say jurisdiction (diocese, metropolitan district, patriarchate), in every country. Before the 1920's there existed no case in the whole history of the Orthodox Church of the same territory being governed by several bishops, in other words, that there existed more than one diocese on the same territory.

Until the present no one objected to this principle. Orthodox belonged everywhere to the same Church organization and were under the jurisdiction of the same bishop regardless of their origin, nationality, class, profession and convictions concerning the affairs of this world. It happened at all times that Orthodox living in the same city were of various nationalities and generally differed in

* Economia is a principle by which the Church eases the strictness of its laws by condescension.

many respects, but before the present it occurred to no one to organize several independent jurisdictions in the same place on account of this fact. Parishes might use different languages. We know that in the second century already there were parishes of different nationalities in the same cities but they always belonged to the same diocese. When the Bulgarians wished to establish their own diocese in Constantinople, the patriarch condemned them. He was right although the Greek hierarchy itself sometimes sinned against Orthodox tradition by compelling other nations to have services in Greek and by imposing Greek priests and bishops on them. From the most ancient times variety of languages in the Church was considered completely normal and in apostolic times already clergymen could be of any nationality. In general the Church does not condemn differences of secular character which might exist among us, but it does not establish its own organization on the basis of them.

Some believe that nationality is far deeper and more spiritual than is territory: nationality is connected with moral consciousness, love of our country and culture; territory is but a section of land, which has no spiritual meaning. Is it not better to establish the Church on more spiritual principles? This question is answered by Our Lord in His teaching about love of neighbors. Our Lord teaches us to love all men, whoever they are. He affirms that the highest and deepest link between men is their unity in God and their faithfulness to Him which is the essence of the Church. The value of national relation and kinship is not denied by Jesus Christ, but He puts them in second place. The commandment about the love of men orders us to love our **neighbors** that is those with whom we are in direct relation and to whom we can do good. Let us remember the parable of the good Samaritan, which was told by Christ exactly for the purpose of explaining who is our neighbor. The thieves who wounded the Jew were probably of the same nationality as he was as also were those who passed by indifferently. His neighbor became the Samaritan, a man of different nation, hostile to the Jews. He became a neighbor because Providence brought him to the side of the wounded man and he did not remain indifferent to his suffering. Therefore to love our neighbor means to love him with whom we are in direct relations even if he is our enemy. Inability, or to say better, lack desire to love our neighbor is the inability or refusal

to be Christian. In search for closeness with people of the same nationality one does not need to be a Christian. If Orthodox living in the same city do not want to belong to the same church organization they ruin the very essence of the Church, which is to unite all neighbors in mutual love and faith in God. Thus the territorial principle is not at all superficial. On the contrary it expresses the fundamental task of the Church, to unite all men, if only communion between them is possible in fact. If people of different nationalities are incapable of uniting even within the Church, they prove that they do not live as Christians but as men of this world.

When St. Paul proclaimed that in the Church there are no Greeks or Jews, no bound or "free, no male or female, but Christ is all and in all," he not only proclaimed the moral commandment of unconditional love among all Christians but also points out the very essence of the Church, that is to be in Christ. In Christ we find communion with God, spiritual perfection, knowledge of truth and justice, the power of Grace, love from God, reconciliation with Him and with men, spiritual purity and liberation from evil. The Orthodox faith, the life in Grace (in particular the sacraments and services), moral law and holiness; all this elevates us above this world and must be the content our Christian life regardless of the nation to which we belong and the form of our life and activity on the earth. The task of Church organization is to organize our common Christian spiritual life because the life of the Church must be Christian and spiritual and not simply one of the forms of wordly social activity. Therefore the organization of the Church, by the very nature of its purpose, must be independent from everything worldly.

If the Church and its organization must be the same for everyone it does not mean that variety is excluded from this unity. There can be different forms of spiritual life (contemplative, active, mystical, moral, ascetic) although all these elements have to be present in some measure in the life of every Christian. There can be different tendencies in theology, especially developing one of its aspects. There can be variety in services and rites. Christians can use different languages. All the more we can have different political convictions and in general a different understanding of the problems of this world. But if such a variety is admissible in the Church it must not be a cause of division. Nevertheless this is exactly what the Orthodox of Western Europe and America have

been doing for the last forty years. We divide the Church according to nationality, language or attitude towards the Communist governments. If some group founds a parish it is inclined to consider it as its own property, independent from any general organization of the Church. If we would really possess the spirit of the Church, we would create national, political and cultural organizations within Orthodox society, without trying to organize a special jurisdiction for each of them. No people would believe that if they found a parish it belongs to them independent from the Church like some organization arising from the private initiative of a group of persons.

Let us discuss the general problems of the place of nationality in Orthodoxy. Since apostolic times the Church blessed patriotism, faithfulness to the state, the use of our own language. If it is good to love our people, the first duty of Christian patriotism is to convert our nation to Christianity, to make it really Christian, to create a national Christian culture and statehood. Christ and the apostles tried to convert their own, that is the Jewish people, first. However the majority of the apostles finally consecrated their life to preaching among other nations. This fact shows that the love of other nations is not less natural and necessary for Christians than patriotism. It is generally easier to serve our own people but sometimes, as it was in the case of Jesus Christ and the apostles, our own nation is closed to Christianity while others are far more open.

The creation of a national Christian culture is a great and honorable task. The Russian culture of the nineteenth century was on the whole Christian and in this lies its great importance. However the main task of the Church is in establishing a purely Christian culture directly connected with theology, church art, services and spiritual life. The national element in such a culture is secondary. Such for example was the Byzantine church culture.

Many Orthodox sincerely believe that Orthodoxy itself is nothing more than a religious form of their national life. They admit necessity for each nation to have a religion even if the latter is not considered important. To some nations this religion is Orthodoxy, therefore it is natural for all those belonging to these nations (for example Russians, or Greeks) to be Orthodox, and to be unfaithful to Orthodoxy for them is to be unpatriotic. Thus religion is lowered to the significance of a simple addition to national life.

There is a more refined but equally incorrect understanding of the national character of religion. It consists in the recognition of an absolutely inseparable link between religion and nation. However important religion may be it is always necessarily national, being the highest creation of the national spirit. If one nation takes on the religion of another it falls under its spiritual influence. From this point of view Christianity is a form of Judaism and all Christian nations are in their religious aspect under the influence of ancient Israel. Orthodoxy becomes a Christian form of Hellenism... Religion outside a nation is an abstraction: in real religion everything is national and is connected to the developement of the national spirit and history.

The only truth in this theory is that the relation between religion and nationality can indeed be very deep and that one nation may be converted by the missionaries of another. However it is wrong that religion is the product of a national spirit. Even the so called natural religions (except primitive paganism) were founded by great religious leaders and thinkers. Their influence on their people was far more considerable than the influence of environment was upon them. Where true religion is concerned its very truthfulness results from the fact that it is based on divine revelation! We believe in the revelation of the Holy Spirit and not of Jewish spirit; Orthodoxy is for us a doctrine preserved in its purity and explained by the God-bearing Fathers, and not the creation of Hellenistic genius. True religion is the gift of God to men, although, once accepted by them it becomes a part of their life. Nations are born and die, are converted to the Faith and lose it, but the Church remains and shall always remain the same. All the faithful, regardless of nationality belong to the one "holy nation" of God, (I Pet., I:9) participating in the Church which was founded not by men and nations but by God. In general it is wrong to consider the Church as a **worldly** or purely human institution. Men and nations can grow spiritually in the Church. Because of their efforts and cooperation with God, the body of the Church can develop. However its essence, that is grace, truth and the spirit of true life, is always of God and not of us or of this world.

The danger of nationalism in the Church is not only in its dividing character but also in the fact that it replaces little by little the spirit of Christianity by national traditions, interests and even pas-

sions. The Church sometimes becomes an instrument of gaining national and political goals. The hierarchy more or less consciously blesses that which is desired by the people and state. Finally the church is led by the nation and not the nation by the Church. Many inadmissible compromises are justified by the affirmation that they serve national interests.

The nationalism of Orthodox people in America inevitably has a double character: one is related to the former fatherland and one to the United States. The second is at present not as strong as the first, although Orthodox are politically absolutely loyal and become rapidly Americanized as far as education and way of life are concerned. The nationalism of the Orthodox people is shown mainly in the Church, in the closeness of those of the same origin and in the particular interest which each group has for their former country. The last two forms of national feeling are completely natural, but the first can be both good and bad. It is good to be faithful to the Christian tradition of our nation but it is bad to divide the Church because of an excessive nationalism and to be indifferent to the Orthodox from other nations. On the other hand it is only deplorable that many Orthodox know so little of their national culture (partly on account of lack of education) and that the second generation of American Orthodox forgets their own national language despite the fact the knowledge of, for example Russian and Greek, is appreciated everywhere. If there are some dangers in nationalism from the religious point of view, it does not mean that we must fight national Christian traditions. In the eyes of the people themselves the latter consist primarily in particular ways of celebrating the services (in language, music, rites, etc). The problem of language must be freely solved by each parish, which can either use only one language or English and the national language simultaneously. The attitude of the Church toward national organizations must be positive, but an excessive or exclusive nationalism only must be condemned. The cooperation of all Orthodox national organizations is certainly very desirable.

It seems to me that taking the strength of nationalism among the Orthodox into consideration, it would be admissible for the sake of economy to have special vicariates or deaneries, uniting the parishes according to their nationality or language, within the limits of each diocese. The Orthodox Church in North America

could be divided into no more than ten dioceses for this purpose, so that in each of them there would be a sufficient number of parishes to form national vicariates or deaneries.

Nevertheless all the parishes existing in a certain territory must be united in only one diocese. This is the requirement of the dogma of the unity of the Church, of the canons regulating Church administration and of Christian ethics calling for the unity of all Christian regardless of their nationality. We must finally understand that the divisions in the Orthodox Church in Western Europe and America may be called at best a „spiritual illness” but more strictly speaking it is a betrayal of Orthodoxy.

The diocesan bishop must have the full authority granted to him by the canons. However it would be natural and desirable to have periodical meetings of the suffragan bishops and deans of the diocese besides regular diocesan conventions of all the clergymen and lay representatives. The vicariates and deaneries could organize their own meetings.

The nationality of candidate for diocesan bishop could be considered as indifferent if this candidate would be accepted by the greater majority of the diocesan convention (for instance by more than 4/5 of voices). In the opposite case a regulation could be established according to which each new bishop should be of a different nationality than the previous one.

The same principle could be applied to the election of the Primate of the whole American Church. Thus the danger that the government of the Church would be taken by one nationality would be eliminated. The head of the American Church should govern in cooperation with the council of all bishops which could be convened twice or thrice yearly.

Only a united Orthodox Church in America would be perfectly Orthodox and strong. Only a united Church could overcome the divisions, disorders and the spirit of separatism which we so often meet. Only a united Church could be able to elevate rapidly the level of Church education by an organized and energetic effort. At present even the bishops very often feel helpless to encourage education. The clergy and laity are often indifferent to this problem. There is neither a sufficient number of well-trained personnel nor

sufficient funds for this purpose. Ignorance of one's own Faith is pernicious for the Church. For this reason thousands of Orthodox leave the Church or become so-called nominal believers... In general our Church does only part of the work which is necessary to be done: there are very few Orthodox schools, very few books about Orthodoxy, no missions, monasticism is weak, Orthodox students in colleges don't receive sufficient religious guidance, the number of chaplains in the armed forces is insufficient, we have no Orthodox hospitals and Orthodox patients are sometimes neglected (e. g. in New York); welfare organizations are weak. Our Church is represented in interdenominational organizations not as it should be. All this is chiefly the consequence of bad organization and lack of experienced personnel. A united Church would certainly overcome all these defects.

At this time the significance of Orthodoxy in America is not great. In the eyes of Americans we are one of the secondary denominations which is divided into many organizations and is not very active. This would change if Orthodoxy were united. The United States is now one of the greatest powers on earth. A strong Orthodox Church in this country could have a great influence all over the world, and could help the Orthodox Churches abroad far more than we now do. It is a real misunderstanding to believe that separate national jurisdictions in America can do more for their mother Churches than could a united Orthodox Church.

When the Orthodox Church in the United States will become strong great missionary possibilities will be open to it in this country itself, in Asia and possibly even in Africa where there are already a few native parishes. If Orthodoxy still has influence in the world it is on account of the interest which other confessions take in it. If the Orthodox would make the same effort to spread Orthodoxy as do other confessions for their own Faith, our Church would have many thousand of converts and its general spiritual and theological influence would be considerably increased. We ourselves badly use the treasures of Orthodoxy and do not open them to others, like the wicked servants who buried their talents.

Would not unification of the Orthodox Church in America lead to its rapid Americanization? Is not Americanization dangerous for the Church?

We face the strange fact, that many Orthodox are inclined to recognize the legitimacy of all nationalisms in the Church except American. For Americans who know English only and are not of Orthodox origin there is very often no room in our Church. In the whole United States there are only a few parishes which entirely use English and which do not declare themselves as belonging to any of the nationalities of the Old World, although even these are parts of some national jurisdiction. This situation is abnormal. I hope that there is no necessity to prove that Americans who have lost the link with their former nationality or are recently converted to Orthodoxy, have a full right not only to be Orthodox, but to have American parishes, which would be open to everybody preferring to use English. A denial of such a right and necessity would be contrary to Orthodox tradition since Apostolic times. The number of such parishes even with a favorable attitude from the hierarchy would increase slowly. The majority of Orthodox parishes will not become purely American before two or three generations. This Americanization must be absolutely free and dependent on the free choice of parishioners and their priests.

The Americanization of the Orthodox Church would make the union of Orthodoxy psychologically easier and would widen the possibilities for educational and missionary work — the latter on condition of the creation of Orthodox literature in English and of the full translation of all services into English. We must not forget that without educational work in English we are unable not only to spread our Church but even to preserve it from the loss of part of our youth. Our American young people sometimes leave the Church because the spiritual richness of Orthodoxy is not sufficiently shown to it.

Without the full English text of Orthodox services the liturgical life of those who know only English is inevitably poor. Already at the present time the greatest part of the parishioners attend only the liturgy. The exceptional spiritual value of the Orthodox services is thus lost to Americans; they are unable to use one of the most important sources of the spiritual, moral and theological education. Even some of our clergymen seem to forget the power of spirituality and depth of theology which is contained in our services.

The dangers of Americanization are real, but they are already active. If our Church would possess a better and stronger organization it would be much easier to fight them. These dangers are as follows: first, the loss of the language and culture of our old countries. Very few among our youth study the culture of their ancestors and even fewer work in this field. Professors of Russian, Greek, Serbian, etc. are mostly Americans having no original connections with these nations... Secondly American education has many negative sides connected with contemporary ideas, psychology, pedagogy, literature, television etc. Our youth is defenceless against such negative influences because in the absence of Orthodox schools and publications it is brought up entirely in the American culture. The clergy often cannot help our youth in this respect because it sometimes possesses neither a higher theological education nor an American college degree. Thirdly the insufficient attention to purely spiritual life which is spread through America undoubtedly affects the Orthodox also. Ambition, vainglory and the habit to praise oneself and others under any pretext is also very common in our Church... Finally, as we have already mentioned, there is a certain influence of American Protestantism and the ambitious anticlericalism of our laity and on the separatism of our parishes.

It is obvious that America not only has defects but also great positive qualities, for example an exceptional vital power, an openness to all that is good, a love of activity and education, a pioneer spirit, a desire and ability to work together, to help each other, to be generous and responsive, to learn one's own defects. All these qualities are also very necessary for us Orthodox. In energy, pioneering, education, organization, solidarity, generosity and in mutual help we are often behind other Americans.

On the one hand, as we see, the dangerous sides of Americanism are already actual and will be the more active the weaker the organization of our Church is. On the other hand we can but desire to assimilate all that is good in America. In any case Americans have no less right to be Orthodox than does any other nation.

However, the unity of the Orthodox Church is necessary not for the purpose of Americanization and not because a rapid denationalization of Greeks, Russians, Syrians and other Orthodox na-

tionalities would be desirable, but for the benefit of the Church and in the name of our faithfulness to Orthodoxy. The present organization of our Church is contrary to Orthodoxy. Therefore all Orthodox must wish that the first step made by our hierarchy toward unity would not be the last one. A kind of federation of the Orthodox Churches in America is welcome as a transitory state only, but not as a final form of organization which must be according to our dogmas and canons a complete unity of all Orthodox in one Orthodox American Church.

Some Quotations

Meletios IV, Ecumenical Patriarch, former Greek Archbishop in America.

We desire to mention also the question of the administration of the Orthodox Church in the **diaspora**... I saw with my own eyes the biggest and the most numerous part of the Orthodox Church in diaspora and I understood the measure in which the name of Orthodoxy would be exalted, especially in the great country of the United States of America, if the two millions of Orthodox Christian were organized there into one united ecclesiastical organization, as an "**American Orthodox Church.**"

(Declaration of enthronement as **Ecumenical Patriarch**, Constantinople, January the 24, 1922, quoted in B. Zoustis, *Hellenism in America and its activities*, in modern Greek, New York, 1954, p. 147).

Tikhon, Archbishop of the Aleutian Islands and North America (later Patriarch of Moscow).

The diocese of North America¹ must be reorganized into an **Exarchate** of the Russian Church in North America. The diocese is not only multinational; it is composed of several orthodox Churches, which keep the unity of faith, but preserve their particularities in canonical structure, in liturgical rules, in parish life. These particularities are dear to them and can perfectly be tolerated on the pan-orthodox scene. We do not consider that we have the right to suffer the national character of the churches here; on the contrary, we try to preserve this character and we confer them the latitude to be guided by leaders of their own nationality. Thus, the Syrian Church here received a bishop of its own (the Most Rev. Rapheal of Brooklyn), who is the second auxiliary to the diocesan bishop of the Aleutian Islands, but is almost independent in his own sphere (the bishop of Alaska having the same position). The Serbian parishes are now organized under one immediate head, who for the time being is an archmandrite, but who can be elevated to the episcopacy in the nearest future. The Greeks also desire to have their own bishop and are trying to settle the matter with the Synod of Athens. In other words, in North America a whole Exarchate can easily be established, uniting all orthodox national

¹ In 1905, when this statement was made, all orthodox national groups in America were united in the jurisdiction of Archbishop Tikhon.

Churches, which would have their own bishops under one Exarch, the Russian Archbishop. Each one of them is independent in its own sphere, but the common affairs of the American Church are decided in a Synod, presided by the Russian Archbishop, Through him a link is preserved between the American Church and the Church of Russia and a certain dependence of the former to the latter. It should be remembered however that life in the New World is different from that of the old; our Church must take this into consideration; a greater autonomy (and possibly autocephaly) should therefore be granted to the Church of America, as compared with the other Metropolitan sees of the Russian Church. The North American Exarchate would comprise: (1) the archdiocese of New York, with jurisdiction over all Russian Churches in the United States and in Canada (2) the diocese of Alaska, for the orthodox inhabitants of Alaska (Russians, Aleutians, Indians, Eskimos). (3) The diocese of Brooklyn (Syrian) (4) the diocese of Chicago (Serbian) (5) a Greek diocese.²

Professor H. Alivizatos, Member of the Greek Academy, Professor of Canon Law at the University of Athens.³

The language of Americans of Greek descent is the English language and, according to the views of the Orthodox Church, it can be used in the liturgy... This is the only means by which their interest towards Orthodoxy will be maintained... The Greek⁴ Orthodox Church, in its Hellenic part, together with the other national branches, will become English speaking in thirty or forty years at the maximum, since no effort is able to maintain the national languages. As an immediate consequence, the present canonical chaos in the administration of the Church in America will be replaced, in the nearest future, by a big united American Greek Orthodox Church, governed by a synod of American bishops. This Church, in due time, will evolve, according to the established pattern, into an independent autocephalous Church. It is evident that the first immigrants of Orthodox descent became the creators of a new branch of Orthodoxy, the American Orthodox Church. The future of this Church, if the above conditions are fulfilled, will be truly great and glorious...

²Opiniuous (Otzvyvy) of Diocesan bishops concerning Church Reforms, submitted to the Preconcilian Commission of the Holy Synod, St. Petersburg, 1906, Part I, p. 531.

³Lectures on the Orthodox Church given in April 1953 and July 1954 at the University and the Ecumenical Institute of Chicago, Ill., published in the "Scientific Journal of the Theological School of the University of Athens," and in a book, **The Greek Orthodox Church**, Athens, 1955, p. 6-9.

⁴The word "Greek" is used here not in its national sense, but in the sense which embraces the whole Orthodox Church (note of H. Alivizatos).

Autory, Metropolitan of the Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese of America.

While we must still minister to many who remember the way and customs of another land it is our policy to make our church in the United States an American Church. In my own archdiocese, under my administration we have pioneered in the introduction of English in our services and our sermons. From the beginning of my ministry I began the printing of English service books, and the training of English speaking priests. We are tied to no sacred language; we recognize all tongues as the creation of God, and employ them in this worship. We have no desire to perpetuate anything but the Gospel of Christ, and that we can do as effectively in English as in any other tongue.⁵

John, bishop of San Francisco.

Time has come for the Orthodox of America, whatever their extraction may be, to understand that the United States of America cannot be considered a colony any more either in political or in ecclesiastical sense. The past is gone. This country has ceased to be an ecclesiastical colony of the English, the Dutch, the Swedes; it cannot remain a spiritual colony of the Greeks, the Serbs, the Romanians, the Russians, whether those of the U. S. S. R. or those "in exile." Americans have indeed won the right (no less than the Cypriots, the Albanians or the Czechoslovaks) to have their own Orthodox Local Church, in conformity with the ecclesiastical canons.⁶

The V. Rev. Prof. George Florovsky, Harvard University.

The Universality of the Orthodox Faith is obscured by human divisions, and it is often forgotten that Orthodoxy is the Church, and therefore is not, and cannot be confined to any territorial or historical boundaries. There should be no limits to the Orthodox expansion, and in new conditions, the Church may speak a new tongue.

It was the glory of the Orthodox Church that, from the very beginning, and throughout the ages, she did address diverse nations in their own idioms, and the Holy Liturgy was celebrated in many tongues. It was the glory of the Orthodox Church that she addressed the Slavs

⁵"The Autiodrian Church and Christian Unity," **The Word** Vol. I, No. 6, June 1957, p. 145.

⁶The Russian American Orthodox Messenger, Vol. 56, No. 10, October, 1960, p. 166.

in their vernacular and encouraged them to worship God in their own language. That glorious example of Sts. Cyril and Methodius, the "Slavic Apostles," has been closely followed by the missionaries of the Russian Church, from the days of when St. Stephen of Perm endeavored to evangelize the Finnish tribes in their own language and adopted the Liturgy to their vernacular, to the days of the great Orthodox "Apostle of Japan," Archbishop Nicolai of Japan, who laid foundations of a Japanese Orthodoxy. The languages are many, and any one should be used for the propogantion of the true faith and for a spontaneous offering of praise and thanksgiving to God, who is God of all nations.⁷

Archimandrite Jerome Kotsonis, Chaplain of the Royal Palace of H. M. the King of the Hellenes, Professor of Canon Law, Theological Faculty, University of Thessalonica.

The problem of the survival of Hellenism in America is essentially a problem of preserving its Orthodoxy... The liturgical and sacramental wealth of our Church must become accessible through the performing of the Divine Liturgy and the other holy sacraments and services in the English language (alongside of the Greek). Since the Roman Church, with its clergy and monastic orders being much better organized than the Orthodox, is obliged today to admit in America as elsewhere the use of the local languages in its liturgy, it is obvious that this is even more necessary for us Orthodox: we do not have the same presuppositions as the Catholic Church, and the use of local language in both liturgy and preaching belongs to the Tradition of our Church...

The unity of all Orthodox Christians in America would very much contribute to the spread of the Orthodox Church in America and would help its prestige, and thus it will better attract the Orthodox youth. Its present influence on the public life of the country is negligible if not non-existent. This situation is due, among other reasons, to our present division into several ethnic groups (Greek, Russian, Romanian, Bulgarian, etc.).... Every effort should be made to unify the Orthodox Church in the U. S. A. This would not mean that the various groups would lose their ethnic character or their inner administrative autonomy...⁸)

⁷St. Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly, Vol. 2, No. 4, Summer 1954, p. 3.

⁸) Anaplasia, Nov. 1955, pp. 507-509.

The Seminary

Report on Sabbatical

I spent in Europe not quite half a year (I arrived with the boat at Cherbourg on August 8th, 1960, and left Cherbourg by boat on my way back to the US., on January 27th, 1961). More than 3 months I spent in Vienna where I was lecturing (at the University of Vienna) from October 12th to January 14th. I delivered two courses at the University of Vienna (for students of the Philosophical Faculty); one (of 32 lectures): "Russian Culture of the 19th century" and the other (of 32 lectures also): "History of Religious Life in Russia"; moreover, I had a Seminar for students of the Slavic Department ("Russian Culture and Religious Thought of the 19th century"). I have also delivered a number of lectures in different place in Austria, Bavaria, Belgium and France (nine lectures on the whole) on the following subjects: "Characteristic features of Russian Culture and Religious Life" (3 lectures), "The Orthodox Church and the Problem of the Union of the Churches" (3 lectures), "The Gospel and our present time" (2 lectures). From September 12th to Sept. 16th I took part in the work of the International Congress of History of Religion in Marburg, West Germany, where I delivered a paper: "The Quest for the Overcoming of Death."

I feel deeply satisfied by my stay in Europe. I think with deepest gratitude of my students and hearers at the University of Vienna who by their friendliness and the interest they have shown, made my work at the University most attractive and rewarding. I was profoundly struck by the intense interest reigning in wide Catholic and Protestant circles (in Austria and Germany) for the Problem of the Union of the Church. There is an eagerness, a warmheartedness and a responsiveness in this respect and a warmth of feelings towards the Eastern Orthodox Church, both from leading Catholic and Protestant circles that made upon me the profoundest impression. A great spiritual movement for the drawing nearer of the different parts of Christianity is on the way. I felt it quite definitely as I was lecturing on this subject ("The Orthodox Church and the Union of Christianity") to Benedictine monks and Catholic students of Theology at the Benedictine Abbey of Heiligenkreutz near Vienna in November 1960, and a little later in the "Society for the Study of the East" in Vienna and at the "Una Sancta" Association in Munich (in both latter cases it was before a mixed auditory of Catholics and Protestants).

It has been a great joy and privilege to me to deliver a lecture (on January 24th, 1961) at the Paris Orthodox Russian Theological Academy

(Institute) of St. Sergius. I have, as always, been strongly impressed and deeply moved by its atmosphere of concentrated study and deep piety.

Nicholas Arseniev

The Seminary Honors Dr. Basil Bensin

On February 15, the Seminary honored Dr. Basil Bensin, one of the founders and first teachers of St. Vladimir's, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday.

Born in 1881 in Czaritsin Kut, Russia, Basil Mitrophanovich Bensin is the son of a priest. He graduated from the seminary of Simferopol and in 1904 received his B. D. degree from the Theological Academy in Moscow. Soon afterwards the late Patriarch Tikhon, then Archbishop of North America, invited him to join the teaching staff of the newly organized theological seminary in Minneapolis. Dr. Bensin returned to Russia in 1912 and began a brilliant scientific career with the Imperial Department of Agriculture; he left Russia in 1919 and continued his scientific work in Czechoslovakia until 1930.

Dr. Bensin came to the United States in 1930, where he took an active role in the life of the Church. He was an ardent advocate of theological education on a high level, when this very idea seemed utopian to the vast majority of the Orthodox here. The All-American Sobor of 1937 accepted his plan of a post-college theological school and when, in the autumn of 1938 St. Vladimir's began its work with four students, Dr. Bensin became the first Faculty Secretary and instructor of the new school. He remained the soul of the Seminary until 1942, when the war interrupted all activity. Dr. Bensin went to Alaska as an employee of the U. S. Geological Survey; the work he accomplished there is best summarized by the citation which accompanied an award from the Fairbanks **Jessen's Weekly**, "His contribution will be a lasting monument to his zeal and earnestness to formulate an Arctic agriculture."

The same words might be applied to his work for the Church, especially for theological education. No generation of St. Vladimir students should ever forget the unique place of Dr. Bensin among the founding Fathers.

After the liturgy on the Feast of Presentation, a special service of thanksgiving was offered at the Seminary chapel, at the end of which Fr. Schmemmann greeted Dr. Bensin on behalf of the faculty and students. The student choir then sang a hearty "Mnogaya Lyeta" and all joined Dr. Bensin in the Common Room, where he spoke on the early days of the theological school in America and of his experiences in Russia and Alaska.

Ordinations

Fr. Vladimir Berzonsky ('60), to the Holy Priesthood, on March 19, 1961, by His Grace Benjamin of Pittsburgh and West Virginia, in Conemaugh, Pennsylvania.

Fr. George Rados ('58), to the Holy Priesthood, on February 5, 1961, by His Eminence Metropolitan Antony, of the Syrian Archdiocese, in St. Haralambos, Canton, Ohio.

Fr. Athanasius Rector ('62), to the Diaconate, on February 18, 1961, by His Grace Archbishop Iriney, in New York City.

Monastic Vows

On March 28, 1961, **Fr. Basil Nagesky** ('59), who for the last year has been serving in Alaska, pronounced his monastic vows at St. Sergius Church, Metropolitan's residence, Syosset, N. Y. Archbishop Iriney gave him the name of Vladimir. On April 6, Hieromonk Vladimir left again for Alaska.

The Christian Way

This year the Alumni Association of the Seminary started a new publication — **The Christian Way**, with the purpose of reaching wider circles of Orthodox Christians and of giving them the meaning of Orthodoxy for life. So far three issues have been published. The Editorial Board consists of the Rev. Fathers George Timko, Daniel Hubiak, Gabriel Ashie, Theodore Labovsky, Michael Draovitch, Serge Kuharsky and Mr. Zoran Milkovich. The circulation is supervised by Fr. Alexander Warnecke and Theodore Fryntsko.

Visits and Lectures

Father Alexander Schmemmann lectured in Detroit (January 21), Los Angeles and San Francisco (January 28 — February 3), Manhattanville College, N. Y. (February 13), Pittsburgh (On Sunday of Orthodoxy, February 26), Providence, R. I. (March 25-26), Englewood (March 29), Detroit (April 2), and in Charleroi, (April 21). He was also lecturer at the Interseminary Conference at Yale, (February 23-24), and Drew University, (March 17); Fr. Alexander also was Adjunct Professor, (Russian Religious thought) at Columbia University.

Father John Meyendorff lectured to the Newman Club, Columbia University; on Byzantine Arts; at the Religious Arts Festival, Columbia University; on Orthodox Ecclesiology at the convention of Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine, Boston; on Scripture and Tradition at the Yale Divinity School. He delivered lectures at the Orthodox communities in Bridgeport, Conn., Singac, N. J., Sea Cliff, N. Y., Jersey City, N. J., and Washington, D. C.

Professor Veselin Kesich spoke on "Catholicity of Orthodoxy" in Minneapolis, (March 26), on "Biblical Theology in Modern Protestantism" at Columbia University. He is the Orthodox editor of the Grolier Encyclopedia.

Father William Schneirla was the speaker on Orthodoxy Sunday at Canton, Ohio, and lectured to the Texas Orthodox communities.

Father Firmilian Ocokolijich has been appointed Secretary of the Standing Conference of the Orthodox Bishops.

The Seminary Choir

The Seminary Choir, trained by Professor Boris Ledkovsky, visited the following parishes: St. Vladimir's, Trenton, N. J., (February 12); Ss Peter and Paul, Syracuse, N. Y., (February 26); St. Nicholas, Auburn, N. Y., (February 26); St. Nicholas, Washington, D. C., (March 4); Ss. Peter and Paul, Jersey City, (March 5); St. Michael's, Philadelphia, (March 12); St. Nicholas, Philadelphia, (March 12); Three Saints, Ansonia, Conn., (March 19); Holy Trinity, Danbury, Conn., (March 19); St. John the Baptist, Warren, Ohio, (March 25); St. Nicholas, Akron, Ohio, (March 26); St. John the Baptist, Campbell, Ohio, (March 26); St. John the Baptist, Singac, N. J., (April 16); St. John the Baptist, Canonsburg, Pa., (April 22); St. Michael's, Rankin, Pa., (April 23); Holy Trinity, Charleroi, Pa., (April 23); Holy Ghost, Bridgeport, (April 30); Christ Saviour, Paramus, N. J., (May 7).

In addition to the above visits, the Choir gave five concerts in Philadelphia, Cambell, Charleroi, New York and at Columbia University's Festival of Religious Arts. The program at these concerts consisted exclusively of the traditional ecclesiastical music, (Znamenny, Kiev, Valamo), which was, according to Father Vladimir Borichevsky, a "Soul-opener" to many listeners. Seminarian David Drillock, (A. B. Columbia University, '60, St. Vladimir, '63), is the student director of the choir and assists Professor Ledkovsky at rehearsals and teaching.

Book Reviews

N. Afanassieff, N. Koulomzine, J. Meyendorff and A. Schmemmann, **LA PRIMAUTE DE PIERRE DANS L'EGLISE ORTHODOXE**. "Bibliothèque orthodoxe." Paris: Delocheaux & Niestle, 1960. 151 pages.

This volume consists of four essays, written by two faculty members of the St. Serge Theological Institute and by two from St. Vladimir's Theological Seminary (Meyendorff and Schmemmann). The last two essays have been published in English in *St. Vladimir's Quarterly*, 4 (1960), and therefore we shall review Fr. Afanassieff's contribution on "The Church that Presides in Love" (pp. 9-64) and Koulomzine's "The Place of Peter in the Primitive Church" (pp. 67-90).

The main thesis of Fr. Aganassieff's essay is based on a description, analysis, and discussion of the theological implications of two ecclesiologies, the universal and the eucharistic. According to the universal doctrine of the church, all local churches form a single organism, and each local church is a part of the universal church. Only this universal church is the Catholic church. St. Cyprian was the first Christian author to understand Matt. 16 17-19 as referring to the universal church. The concept of primacy is inevitably connected with this "universal ecclesiology," Fr. Afanassieff convincingly proves.

This ecclesiology was not the ecclesiology of the primitive church. Universal ecclesiology replaced what Fr. Afanassieff calls "eucharistic ecclesiology." According to this doctrine, each local church where Christ is present, where the Eucharist is celebrated, is the Church of God in Christ. Each local church is the Catholic Church, and therefore she manifests the fullness of Revelation. The first representative of this ecclesiology after the New Testament period is St. Ignatius, who did not conceive of the doctrine of primacy.

Fr. Afanassieff argues very forcefully that the significance of the Eucharist is diminished if a local church is only part of a single universal organization. The fullness and catholicity of the church is expressed in each local church, where the Eucharist is celebrated. Therefore this ecclesiology excludes the idea of primacy. Instead Fr. Afanassieff suggests another concept, that of priority. Whereas primacy is an attribute of one bishop, who rules over the church, priority is an attribute of one of the local churches. It is not based upon power, nor is it a "right"; it is based upon the authority of the witness which the local church bears to the love of God. It is a gift of God and a manifestation of **agape**. God's love is the foundation of the Church and of every local church, and priority proceeds from this **agape**.

This essay is an original contribution to the understanding of an Orthodox eucharistic ecclesiology. The author warns that this ecclesiology is some-

times obscured on the surface by elements of a universal ecclesiology, which have been frequently introduced by the Orthodox in their fight against Rome.

The second essay is again a very welcome contribution to an understanding of the problem of Peter's primacy, from a Russian Orthodox scholar. Koulomzine analyzes in some detail the place and the role of Peter in the primitive church, primarily on the basis of material given in the Book of Acts. In the primitive Church, as it is described in Acts 1-5, Peter was the first among the Twelve. His role was unique. With the spread of the church (Acts 6-12), Peter again occupies first place, "but his role in the Church remains tied to the role the Twelve and the role of Jerusalem." After his departure from Jerusalem (Acts 12), Peter was not connected with any particular local Church. His was an itinerant ministry, similar to the work of Paul. In this period, the author writes, Jerusalem became one local church among many. It was no longer the hierarchical center which it had been in the previous period. The author concluded that the words of Matt. 16:18 are manifested in Jerusalem. It is here that Peter fulfilled the promise of Luke 22:32, and again it is in Jerusalem that Peter played the role of the pastor of the Church (Jn. 21:15-17).

All four of the essays in the volume are characterized by positive exposition. They are not written in a polemic spirit. This is an achievement in itself. The main preoccupation of the authors is to clarify the issues, to consider the main problem in the light of Biblical and patristic tradition, and to approach it in a new way.

The volume is issued by "Bibliothèque Orthodoxe," which is under the direction of B. Bobrinskoy, O. Clement, B. Fize, and J. Meyendorff. Soon we may expect other important works in this series in the field of Eastern Orthodoxy. St. Vladimir's Seminary has already started an "Orthodox Library," under the direction of Fr. Schmemmann. If the two series are coordinated, we may expect that both will make a contribution to Orthodox scholarship, to selfunderstanding, and to the interpretation of the Church to the non-Orthodox.

Veselin Kesich.

**John Meyendorff, L'EGLISE ORTHODOXE Hier Et AUJOURD'HUI,
Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1960, 200 pp.**

This book is a general introduction to the historical past of the Orthodox Church, its present position and strength in the world, its liturgical life, canonical structure, doctrine and spiritually. Despite the breadth of the subject, the various themes are smoothly intergrated, and the book is a unified and successfully organized work, containing thoughtful and original insights.

In discussing the past, Fr. Meyendorff related to it the most important modern discussions regarding the doctrine and the life of the Church, demonstrating that some questions from this past are still relevant at present. In

the preface the author stressed the particular place which the Orthodox Church occupies in the modern discussion of union. As the Church of the unbroken tradition, the guardian of the faith of the Apostles and the Fathers, she proposes union by way of return, not to the past, for this is impossible, but to the common Catholic tradition, to the fulness of Revelation.

The author stresses that in modern discussions among the Christian churches, the central problem is the doctrine of the Church. He points very clearly to the difference between the Orthodox Church and other Christian Churches. For example, he refers to the role of the episcopate and the relations between the local and the universal church in Roman Catholicism, both of which are unacceptable to the Orthodox. Similarly, the Protestant rejection of the doctrine of an infallible Church cannot be accepted by the Orthodox Church.

The only way to union is to take these doctrinal differences seriously into account. This basic conviction guides the author in his examination of the schism and the attempts toward union in the Middle Ages (ch. III). Although the essential reasons for the schism were of a doctrinal nature, the real religious differences were never treated profoundly in the various efforts at union. The negotiations were conducted primarily between the Pope and the Emperors, and political considerations were given predominance over religious doctrines. In practice, the author says, the Byzantine Church did not participate in these discussions. Why was this so? The book suggests that the concept of Caesaropapism, erroneously applied by the West to the Byzantine Empire, contributed considerably to the bitterness which these endeavors for union produced between East and West. In order to reunite the churches, it was not enough to convert the Emperor.

From the discussion in this chapter, many fruitful conclusions may be drawn for the present situation. We frequently hear that it is imperative for Christian churches to unite for political reasons. The past should be a warning to us not to minimize or overlook the doctrinal differences.

In dealing with the relationship between the Empire and the Church in Byzantium and the significance of the Ecumenical Councils, the author touches on Western Complaints about the lack of precision in definitions in the Orthodox Church. Thus the relations between Empire and Church were never fundamentally clearly defined. This indefiniteness in their relations bears witness, Father Meyendorff observes, to the essential tension between the church and the world. When we examine the problem of authority in the church, we find again the same lack of precision in definition. Authority is clearly defined both in Roman Catholicism and in Protestantism, but not in the Orthodox Church. Ecumenical councils in the Orthodox interpretation "were never automatic organs of doctrinal infallibility" (p. 34). According to Khomiakoff the whole church accepted them as ecumenical since they expressed her inward thought. They are the voice of the Church. The Catholic Church found such a definition of authority too vague and anarchic, whereas the Protestant churches, relying on written revelation, found it too

arbitrary and selfcontradictory. Yet for the Orthodox the councils bear witness to Christ's presence in the church and the age of Church councils is the "normative period" of Christianity (p. 35).

It is impossible in this review to do justice to the significant observations that are to be found in this book. Another valuable aspect is the accurate and up-to-date information that may be found there. For example, in the chapter on the Orthodox Church today (ch. VIII), the author gives a summary account of all Orthodox churches, with short histories of their development and an account of their present situation. Several pages are devoted to the situation of the Orthodox Church in America, and St. Vladimir's Seminary, in the author's words, "constitutes the principal nucleus for the unification of American Orthodoxy." (p. 160).

This book is a significant contribution to the literature on Orthodoxy, both because of the range and accuracy of the information contained in it and its thought-provoking analysis of the relations between the past history of the Church and its position in the modern world. If it were translated into English, it would be a still more valuable contribution, in view of the dearth of high-quality material in English on the Orthodox Church.

Veselin Kesich

Donald A. Lowrie, REBELLIOUS PROPHET, A LIFE OF NICOLAI BERDYAEV. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. 303 pages.

In this work Donald A. Lowrie gives us a complete biography of Berdyaev, one of the most important modern thinkers. Berdyaev's background, the development of his thought, his life and his work in Russia before the revolution and his activities in Berlin and Paris are the themes of this informative book. The author searched out material in the Soviet Union as well as in Berlin and Paris and he chronicles not only the development of Berdyaev's ideas but his friends and foes, his broken friendships and newfound friends. The "rebellious prophet" is described and looked upon from many angles.

The key to Berdyaev's thought, the author suggests, lies in his personality. Berdyaev is pictured as a rebel. He first rebelled against the aristocracy that formed his background, he rebelled when he accepted Marxism, then again when he rejected it. Yet in his rebellion he never broke completely with his past life or allegiances. He remained an aristocrat until his death, and Marxism influenced his conception of philosophy, in the sense that he believed that philosophy should not only be about something but should be a force to change the life of man.

Berdyaev's is not a systematic philosophy; his writings were produced in the heat of ideological and personal conflict. These conflicts furnished the field for his enormously creative thought, but they were not conducive to orderly exposition.

Berdyayev accepted Christianity. He believed that only through it could he justify belief in God and man. Dostoyevsky played an enormous role in Berdyayev's spiritual formation. His Christ, Berdyayev stated repeatedly, is the Christ of "The Legend of the grand Inquisitor." Yet, as Lowrie describes Berdyayev, he "loved humanity in general but not in particular."

There is a good chapter on Berdyayev's attitude toward the Church, the Bible, the sacraments and dogmas. Many in the West have considered him a spokesman and representative of the Eastern Orthodox Church. He was not, and he never claimed to be. However, the author indicates, many accepted him as the main representative of Orthodoxy out of admiration, because they wanted to believe that what Berdyayev wrote and spoke was the expression of the mind of the Eastern Church. "For the Anglicans," Lowrie writes, "with their century-old longing for closer relation with the Eastern Churches, his was so acceptable a message that they wanted it to be the voice of Russian Orthodoxy, and some there are to this day who so believe." The widespread appeal, in and out of religious circles, of Berdyayev's thought is absorbingly discussed and analyzed in this book.

So far this is not only the most complete book about Berdyayev's life but also a good introduction to his thought. Lowrie knew Berdyayev intimately and is apparently well acquainted with Berdyayev's writings. There is a very full bibliography of Berdyayev's writings, chronologically arranged.

Veselin Kesich.

Lucien Cerfaux, THE FOUR GOSPELS (An historical introduction), translated from the French by P. Hepburne-Scott. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, and London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1960, 145 pp.

Mgr. L. Cerfaux is a well-known French Roman Catholic Biblical scholar. His two books, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul* and *The Church in the Theology of St. Paul*, are much appreciated here as well as in Europe. The present work is comparatively much briefer than the two on St. Paul, and it contains no technical scholarly discussions or vocabulary. This does not mean that scholarly achievements or contemporary scholarly hypotheses are not used or commented upon, however. The author's method is that of positive exposition. He does not directly attack the scepticism of the extreme form-critics and their distinction between the Christ of faith and the Jesus of history. Yet it is not difficult to recognize that important current problems in New Testament scholarship are implied and discussed by the author, especially in the chapter on "The 'Good News' and the Apostolic Tradition" (pp. 1-24). This is done in an attractive way, with many suggestive comments. For example, when referring to the critics who are concerned with the formation of the Gospel tradition, i. e., with the various forms in which this tradition was preserved, Cerfaux writes, "There is nothing to stop us treading in the critics' footsteps, provided it be granted that the actual sayings, the actual facts, take shape quite normally, without distortion, in the already

existing literary forms. The 'News from all Quarters' column in a newspaper is a literary form too, and obeys certain laws: the local correspondents, when they report a fire, resort to clichés. Does it follow there was never any fire? We crave pardon for such a **simpliste** argument, but it is neither more nor less so than the fundamental fallacy of the school which calls itself 'the method of the history of literary forms,' and denies in principle the objective truth of every story whose 'form' already existed." (pp. 22-23).

The author discusses each of the four Gospels separately. In the solution of the problems regarding the Synoptic Gospels, he is definitely committed to the decision of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 1911. According to this Commission, Matthew was the first one to write a Gospel in Aramaic, and he wrote not simply a collection of sayings (*logia*) but a complete Gospel. This Gospel was translated into Greek. The Aramaic Gospel and its translation were substantially the same. Cerfaux admits that Matthew borrowed from Mark, but it is the Greek Matthew, not the Aramaic, that contains these borrowings (p. 28). He believes that it is possible to go beyond this admission and to say that "the primitive Gospel of Matthew was known to Mark and that the cause of the **basic** resemblance between the first two Gospels is not that our Greek Matthew drew its Gospel material from Mark but that the Aramaic Matthew has for ever stamped the narrative with the imprint given it by Matthew, the secretary of the primitive tradition" (pp. 28-29). This is a very provocative theory. The question remains as to what extent the opinions of Roman Catholic scholars on these matters are the result of minute examination of the available data and to what extent they are influenced by the decisions of the Biblical Commission in Rome.

With regard to the relations between John and the Synoptics, the author asserts that many of the sayings in the Synoptics correspond to those in John. They are presented in different contexts and therefore at first they are not easily distinguishable. In the discourses of the Fourth Gospel, John's particular way of presentation may be observed, "but the doctrine is that of the common tradition" (p. 88).

There is a chapter on "the Tetramorphic Gospel" (ch. 6), where the author discusses in an attractive and stimulating way how the written Gospels replaced the oral tradition and why the Church received the "tetramorphic" Gospel (one single Gospel in four editions or forms) and rejected the **Diatessaron** (one Gospel formed out of the four Gospels).

This is a small but rich volume. Those interested in the origin of the Christian faith will find this book interesting, valuable and profitable.

Veselin Kesich.

Philip Sherrard, ATHOS: THE MOUNTAIN OF SILENCE. London. Oxford University Press, 1960. Pp. 110. 57 illustrations, with color photographs by Paul Dumarchie V. Voorthuysen. 50 s. net (in U. K. only). \$12.50 (in the U. S. A.).

This is the first of a new series of scholarly, illustrated books in color on selected places. It is perhaps highly fitting that the series should begin

with the ancient monastic center of Eastern Orthodox Christendom, Mount Athos, the Mountain of Silence in view of the 1000th anniversary of the founding of Mount Athos in 1961.

Dr. Philip Sherrard, a Fellow of St. Antony's College, Oxford, author of the recent important book, *The Greek East and the Latin West*, and an expert on Greek Orthodoxy, was a happy choice for the inauguration of the new series. The color reproductions in this book are beautifully done and the text, though scholarly and highly informative, provides a brilliant verbal background to the even more brilliant photography.

After a brief chapter on the beauty and background of Mount Athos, Dr. Sherrard describes the development of monasticism on Athos from its origins to the present, in which is included a discussion of the current organizational set-up of the monastic communities, the art and architecture of the monasteries, and the physical and spiritual life of the monks. The five basic chapters ("Athos, the Holy Mountain," "The History of Athonite Monasticism," "The Organization of Monastic Life on Athos," "The Life of the Monk," and "The Contemplative Life") are well written and well documented. The reader of Dr. Sherrard's *Athos* can rest assured that he will have in his hands an authoritative account of the Holy Mount, with notes and bibliography, that uses the best of primary and secondary sources (Sherrard is, however, apparently unaware of Constantine Cavarinos's *Anchored in God*), and one that is strengthened and illuminated by personal contact with monastic life on Athos itself.

The way of Athos, Sherrard clearly indicates, is the way of silence. The way of silence is practiced by purification of soul and body from the effects of the "fall," a purification which precedes the raising of the mind to the meditation of divine realities. The final stage of the way of silence is union with the Divine Itself. "For in it, man is resurrected to, or renewed in, that state for which he was created 'in the beginning'." (p. 102) To this way of silence and ultimate "deification" are the monks of Mount Athos dedicated. Dr. Sherrard, with the aid of magnificent color photography and excellent scholarship, has managed to capture vividly the essence of Mount Athos, both past and present.

John E. Rexine.

Colgate University

Nicholas Cabasilas, *COMMENTARY ON THE DIVINE LITURGY*. Translated by J. M. Hussey and P. A. McNulty. With an introduction by R. M. French. London: S. P. C. K., 1960. Pp. 120. Frontispiece. 18s 6d net.

This English translation of a fourteenth century Byzantine theologian's *Commentary on the Divine Liturgy* is both a welcome one and a timely one. Nicholas Cabasilas's work on the Divine Liturgy has long been available in

its original Greek form. Though known to the West since 1560 when it appeared in Paris, the French translation in the "Source Chretiennes" is out of print and hardly accessible to the general reading public. This is the first English translation available of a lay theologian's work whose influence in his own time was considerable and whose work on the Divine Liturgy is an extremely useful and valuable contribution for those within the Orthodox faith in English-speaking countries whose knowledge of Greek can no longer be assumed and for those outside the Orthodox faith who are interested in the liturgical worship of the Eastern Orthodox Church. The publication of this work in English now makes this commentary available to a much wider audience than has hitherto been possible.

The Foreward provides brief descriptive information about Cabasilas's background, and the Introduction by R. M. French offers the reader an exegesis of the Greek liturgy with ample quotations from the Service itself. Cabasilas's **Commentary**, in fifty-three brief but inspirational chapters, comments in detail upon the Byzantine liturgy. The general breakdown of the work follows the natural division of the Liturgy itself: (1) Introduction and the Prothesis; (2) The Liturgy of the Catechumens; (3) (4) The Liturgy of the Faithful; (5) A Theological Parenthesis; (6) Thanksgiving and Closing Prayers. Particularly noteworthy are Cabasilas's answers to Roman criticisms of the Byzantine liturgy.

This new translation of **A Commentary on the Divine Liturgy** will provide the serious reader and worshipper with a highly inspirational but not popular commentary on the most important service in the Eastern Orthodox Church. The **Commentary** will increase the worshipper's appreciation and participation in the Divine Liturgy; it will give the general reader a clear idea of **Byzantine mystagogia**, its nature, its force, and its beauty.

John E. Rexine.

Colgate University

THE DAY OF LIGHT: The Biblical and Liturgical Meaning of Sunday.
H. B. Porter. 86 pp. Greenwich, Conn. The Seabury Press, 1960.

That the fact of the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ is the central and culminating point of our religion is accepted by every Christian and, consequently, it follows that the weekly commemoration of that event, Sunday, is the center and focus of the Christian's week of labor and sacrifice. Oftentimes it is the most obvious that is overlooked, and, apparently, that is what has happened in liturgical studies in regard to Sunday. At any rate, the whole question has received too little attention and it is therefore with pleasure that we can all greet the efforts of Professor Porter in this direction.

The work can be divided into two parts. The first deals with the historical and biblical observance of the Sabbath, connecting it with the Old Testamental idea of the week and the notion of creation which culminated in it as

a day of rest. This is then linked to the sanctification of the first day by the Resurrection which is the culmination of the new creation in Christ. Our author then traces the history through the Patristic Age, the medieval period, and up to the present time.

To Professor Porter is due a word of praise with regard to the method which he has employed in this study. All too often in the history of Christian scholarship we have met with a rigid scholasticism whose dependence upon pure logic and whose lack of appreciation for the biblical and traditional themes have led it astray into paths which can occasionally be called unchristian if not actually anti-Christian. Recently, however, we have seen a refreshing movement away from this tendency and a return to the ancient methods, although not all of these attempts have succeeded fully and most of the rest have still been too tied down to the dogmatic prejudices of the scholastics (upon whom their own creedal confessions are dependent) to produce entirely acceptable conclusions from an Orthodox point of view.

There are two ways of understanding: one is by logical thinking, the other is by "Organic" understanding. In the one we attempt to stand outside the reality and determine step by step what is strictly true about it. In the other, we act more psychologically and, through a sympathetic retracing of its development, we try to view it as a whole and as a necessity. Now, of course, it is true that no one can think completely in one of these ways or the other; they are inseparable. If a proposition is true it can usually have some logical proof for being true, but once proved it suddenly appears to us to be true as an organic whole and not just as a series of true propositions in a syllogism. On the other hand, although it is seen to be true "organically" we still think about it more or less logically, for without logic, no matter how primitive, there is no thinking process at all. It being true that these approaches cannot really be separated, they can, nevertheless, be distinguished and not confused as was the case with the scholastics. These thinkers assumed that the whole method of intellectual investigation into the truths of the Christian religion was a purely logical affair. They seem to have thought that the various ideas contained in Revelation were merely propositions to be proved by logical reasoning and that deductions logically made from these propositions were true whether or not they fit into the whole scheme of things organically. Revelation is, however, really a presentation of God in human affairs, ultimately by His taking on of human flesh and dwelling among us to live a perfect human life. Since He Himself is Truth and not merely a dispenser of true propositions, we must grasp a total organic image of Him, we must participate in Him, not merely in the literal meanings of His words. The Truth will not be contrary to a logical application of it, but not every logical application is necessarily true. This one-way door of Christian logic must be understood. Otherwise we shall end up with what the Fathers called "carnal knowledge" and be led astray.

When trying to explain our faith we must, therefore, attempt to draw a total picture, an image, an organic whole which is, in reality, a verbal representation of God's Image given finally in Christ Himself.

In this connection, Professor Porter has not been entirely successful, but his attempt to draw a total picture of Sunday and to recapitulate "The elements of our Faith which are borne out in this weekly observance, is certainly encouraging, especially for us Orthodox who need very much to again enter into our ancient method of study and explanation, not so much because we have fallen away from it (although an immitation of the scholastics and historical critics has been unfortunately too widespread among our scholars), but mostly because we have lately been rather negligent in our studies as a whole. This is especially deplorable when one realizes how important study is in the Orthodox ideal.

The study under discussion was not able to go into the question of Sunday observance to the extent that it perhaps deserves, and this is understandable because of the shortness of the work and the fact that it is something of a side issue. However, the question is discussed, and Professor Porter rightly points out that Sunday has its integrity as a day of worship for us, i. e., it has lost the unity which centers in the celebration of the Resurrection of Christ and has become a day on which certain works are forbidden and certain devotions are prescribed. The Eucharist, far from being the essence of this celebration, has become but one of the customary devotions. The day itself has come to be understood as merely a substitution for the Sabbath of the Old Testament, taken according to its Pharisaic interpretation. All of this is true, but Professor Porter goes on to say that this is a wrong situation because the two days have totally different reasons for being. The Sabbath of the Old Israel was supposedly based upon the Jewish ceremonial law, while the celebration of the First Day in the New Israel lies in the Resurrection of Christ. To accept the Sabbath is to accept "the claims of that law and all that it presupposes" (page 20). This is only if you accept the Pharisaic and sectarian view of the Sabbath held in the first century and by apostate Jews since that time

The Sabbath is a day of rest: that is what the word itself means. The seventh day was the day upon which God rested from the creation — i. e., Sabbath was, in ancient times, directly connected with our original creation. Man, by his fall, destroyed the fullness of his original state and came near to falling back into his pre-created state — i. e., chaos and non-existence.

The Sabbath, therefore, was a day upon which man could, by God's grace, see a glimpse of the state from which he had fallen and which was again promised to him. This he accomplished by "keeping it Holy." Now, no one could keep it perfectly holy, and so the glimpse remained only a glimpse. On that blessed Sabbath wherein our Lord lay in the tomb, however, all mortal flesh kept silent, and in Him the Sabbath was perfectly kept. On the next day He rose from the dead and with Him the whole Church entered into that perfect day of light which has no night, and of which the Sabbath of old was but a faint foreshadowing. The relation of the two is, therefore, one of type to reality and they are not opposed one to the other. The violation of this comes when we obstinately prefer to celebrate the seventh day, because, it means that we reject the truth of its fulfillment in Christ — it

means that we are still living in the age of shadows and reject the truth of the Gospel.

Now it would seem to follow from this that the regulations given by God for the carrying out of the day of rest have some value for us. Certainly, if He gave them and our Lord fulfilled them, they cannot be sinful in themselves. This is not to say that the **pharisaic interpretations** were not sinful. Jesus Christ says that they were. It does not even mean that we have to fulfill **all** of them — they were not binding on us in that sense, but it does mean that they are good for us as pointers in how we are to celebrate the Resurrection, the New Creation. This includes the performance of good works, because our Lord so interpreted the **old law**, correcting the Pharisees when He defended the performance of good works on the Sabbath. "There remaineth, therefore, a Sabbath to the people of God. For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from His own works, as God did from His. Let us hasten, therefore, to enter into that rest." (Hebrews 4:9-11).

All in all, this is a book which, as I have indicated before, is one which needs to be pondered by every Christian. It is an intensely practical one, and upon its subject lies the center of our life of piety — i e., the life of our outward expression of our inward state. The way we observe our religion as a whole is an index of the way we really feel about things.

Keith McKean.



The office of the Quarterly is constantly receiving requests for back issues, especially from libraries which wish to maintain complete sets.

At the present time following issues are out of print:

V. 1 (Old Series) No. 1, Fall 1952

V. 1 " No. 3-4, Spring, Summer 1953

V. 2 " No. 1, Fall 1953

V. 3 " No. 1-2, Fall 1954, Winter 1955

V. 1 (New Series) No. 2, April 1957

V. 2 " No. 1, Winter 1958

V. 2 " No. 2, Spring 1958

Persons possessing copies of these issues who do not need them are asked to give or sell these copies back to the Seminary.